

# The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XLIII No. 10 OCTOBER 1958

## CLERICAL SCENES REVISITED

NORMANDY 1944-58

THEY were not the brightest scenes fourteen years ago. Normandy in June 1944 received the heaviest assault force that has ever crossed the sea. To put it mildly, after fourteen years the background has changed. The beaches have gone strenuously gay with *Camping*; pleasure boats fuss about the sea; oysters are back in the beds.

People have changed too. The absence of some, perhaps more than the presence of well-remembered things like the slim church spires near the mouth of the River Orne, stirs memories from which all sharpness has gone: all emotions are remembered now in great tranquillity.

First of all, for he was tranquil by nature and grace and therefore close to the traveller's present mood, let memory salute the good priest I first met after landing on the famous Beach "J" for "Juno": the Abbé Bourdon, Curé of Courseulles.

His was not the face to launch a thousand ships but none could have given them a more blessed, unsurprised welcome. He gazed at the thousand and more anchored off his shore with an air of parochial proprietorship, as if his boundaries had been redrawn to take in an extra lane or two. He stuck fast through the landings. His church was not hit; given that the village was the heart of our middle beach, his parish had come off remarkably lightly. There were not many men to be seen; all the young ones were away with the Labour Force in Germany. Of young and old, he said sadly: "They have lost the will to work."

He received me, the first chaplain he had met, with great and holy simplicity. You would have thought he was expecting me to drop in any day. That I came with the thousand ships instead of dropping off a bus caused him no astonishment. He offered a simple meal; I gave him a Mass kit from the *Cap Touraine*, an ex-German vessel with our force. He paced me round his parish and was delighted to be introduced to our

men. I remember with satisfaction our naval brass-hats showing the right deference to him in the street.

His altar and his house were mine, he told me, at any time. It was rarely I could avail myself of them. I stayed only one night, I think, in his Presbytery, the night before we left that area for good. He stood next day in the little street by his church to wave me goodbye and gave me a picture of the Curé d'Ans on which he had written in spidery black ink: *Union de Prières J. Bourdon June 1944*. I still have it.

The other day I stood on the spot from which he waved me goodbye. A newish plaque on the wall just above where he had stood proclaimed that the street had a new name. It was now "Rue Abbé Bourdon". He has been dead some years and I must confess I was surprised to see his name remembered. For he had no illusions about his Norman people. The war had not greatly increased their devotion or even lifted them up to the minimum. But there, they remembered him! On the continent, of course, streets are likely to change names with every swing of political fortune. It may be my first clerical host on French soil will not long have his name in blue and white alongside the church he loved so well. For however brief a spell it was good to see it there, commemorating a good man bewildered by big events and humbly loyal to his task when so much of France had fallen into despair.

From the sea I could see the churches of his confrères: the fine one at Bernières (which the soldiers at once called "Benares") and the spire of our Lady's Shrine at Délivrande. The Curé of Bernières was almost the perfect French Curé of fiction: tall, thin, his white hair worn long, the jabot tucked below his well-turned chin.

The other day, there was so much to remember on the shore that I had little time to visit among the curés of the hinterland. Grim German pill-boxes had survived but little remained of our own gear. The "Gooseberry" Harbour at Courseulles had disappeared. So had the "Gooseberries" on "Gold" and on "Sword" Beaches. They told me something remained of the big "Mulberry" Harbour at Arromanches. I didn't visit it: that much-publicized harbour had less poignant memories than "Sword", "Juno" or "Gold" Beaches. It was the little Goose-

berries, formed by crescents of sunken ships, that had the rougher role and no trumpets. The memory came back of saying Mass on the "Sword" Gooseberry for a group of men whose nerve had nearly gone. Jerry was firing high-fragmentation shells from the right bank of the Orne with unpleasant accuracy and frequency. At night our men crept aboard the old French battle-wagon *Jean Barth*, the king-pin of that crescent of dead ships. (Curious to go ashore from the *Jean Barth* one day at Hermanville, opposite the "Sword" Gooseberry, and find on the wall of the first house I entered an old calendar with the *Jean Barth* displayed in all its pristine glory—about 300 metres from where the battered warrior lay scuttled in the sand!)

From the shore orchards and cornfields rise gently towards the woods where so many Canadians, 50th Division Highlanders, and D.L.I.s were laid to rest. I thought I could identify the distant farm where during one afternoon's battle I lay asleep in the barn. Not a very active participation, you will say! But take into consideration three nights spent crawling round ships without sleep and the fact that on shore the war really belonged to the "Pongos" (as the Navy calls the land forces). During that shake-down in the barn I seemed to hear a Lancashire voice speaking rudimentary French. "*Seul Un . . . Seul Un . . .*" the voice said time and time and time again. Was it some sort of premonition and had I just one more night to live (although "night" even in Lancashire French would have been feminine)? Believe it or not, I later discovered that the Army dentist was putting in time during the battle attending to the farmer's daughters' teeth. With all the fluency of five years' French at St Bede's he was telling them that one *egg* was enough. One egg, one tooth, was his message. The farmer's daughters were each carrying a large basketful.

That was, however, hardly a clerical scene. Let me switch from memories of the beaches (where poor Fr Peter Firth fell, R.I.P.) inland to Rouen. Poking there among the ruins of what had been an English Poor Clare Convent in the sixteenth century, I had met two nuns of the Visitation Order which held the Convent for the last two or three centuries. There was a flourishing community of thirty-four Visitandines until the night

we bombed the bridges at Rouen and, alas, hit the Convent as well. The community had arranged themselves either side of the refectory during the bombardment. There the arches were oldest and strongest. The Sisters stood in order of profession so that down one side were the seventeen seniors and down the other the seventeen younger ones of the community. The bomb hit the side of the juniors and wiped them out all but one Sister. She was Irish, by the way, though she had almost forgotten how to speak anything but French. Her arm was broken and would not mend.

I had said Mass for the Sisters in their ruined chapel one night; a Requiem Mass, with a little choir of matelots and the remnant of the community grouped where their choir stalls had been. We were open to the sky and already the weeds were invading the chapel precincts. The community had found asylum in the other Visitation Convent of Rouen. There I paid a visit one day to see the Mother Prioress of the destroyed Convent. In the huge parlour where I waited hidden machinery grated suddenly and the shutters receded from the grill. I was facing an ocean of Visitandines—three communities of them: the two of Rouen and another refugee community from Metz. After suitable introductions I was lightly informed that I should now give them a full picture of the progress of the war in their country. This I did eventually on lines of strict economy (like the Army dentist with the farmer's daughters), repeating short key phrases with slight variations.

The other day I returned to this Convent and sat in the same parlour before the same formidable grill. Mother Prioress came and proved to be the prioress of the destroyed Convent. She has been elected Superior of the Convent that gave refuge to her stricken community. The Irish Sister with the broken arm was back in Ireland with a new foundation of Visitation nuns. This was regarded as a very happy development: for unfortunately new vocations had not come forward in Rouen to replace those claimed by the bomb. (Not that there are no vocations in Rouen; one extremely vigorous Order seems to claim them all!) After my visit to the Visitation nuns, I went up Mont Saint Aignan and Mont aux Malades. On those heights above the City of Rouen the Germans had the Operations

Room which commanded their U-boat warfare in home waters. We paid them the compliment of taking over and setting up our headquarters for the assault areas on the same premises. The nearest church was one dedicated to St Thomas of Canterbury. The parish priest was a little apple-cheeked Norman engaged in the autumnal occupation of all good Normans, the making of cider and maybe applejack (Calvados). From certain requests he made I fear he had the vaguest ideas where petrol came from. Perhaps that also was an easy decoction—from naval orchards? Fourteen years has changed his parish. He has been succeeded by a very amiable mathematics professor from the seminary. In one home near St Thomas's, where fourteen years ago father and mother gently ruled a large brood of sons and daughters, the mother and one daughter were dead; the father very much enfeebled. Relays of grandchildren were scooped in from the four winds to gaze upon me. One son whom I remembered in schoolboy knickerbockers was now a priest and professor of psychology. In the intervening years he had stormed the universities of Rome and Belgium. He spoke with dry humour and a certain dignity which I found delightful.

I had the chance to check on another home. In 1944 there were three in the family: the widow of a French soldier of the First War, a son and a daughter. The mother died ten years ago. The daughter has married and now has seven children. The son was a priest with the most brilliant degree in Geology that France has awarded in recent times. He is now at the Collège de France but I saw him at his little parish in Normandy where he was engaged in a running fight with the mayor about the position of the Village Crucifix. (He won all right. The mayor made the mistake of building a bus shelter on the spot chosen by the priest for the Crucifix but how was the mayor to know the priest had a second and better site in mind? This he promptly occupied as soon as the mayor had overreached himself.) In his village church they had found an English and a German soldier, both dead. They buried them side by side in the graveyard. I sang the Grand' Messe one Sunday for them—and for all the others.

St Thérèse let fall one of her large-size roses on the men of the Gooseberry at "Sword" Beach. I remembered the incident

after fourteen years, on the revisited shore. As I have said, that "Gooseberry" lay under the severe and precise shelling of the German batteries on the right bank of the Orne. I said to the men at Mass: "Not very far from here, inland, is the shrine of a little Saint who comes to people's help if they ask her very simply. Very simply then I ask her to take this part of the assault area under her care. I assure you all that there will be no more casualties among you." *Factum est ita!* Not another man was even scratched. An order came just after Mass to evacuate that Gooseberry. When Jerry resumed his practice there was no one there.

For that reason and for many others I resolved to get into Lisieux as soon as it was liberated. Here too "liberation" was a painful process. As Jerry fell back from Caen we attempted to smash his communications at the knot of roads in Lisieux and flattened half the town in the process. Jerry, however, made very good time along the roads outside. I have heard it said that our bombardment scarcely held him up but that may be prejudiced hearsay.

I got into the town pretty early. Bishop Falaise, a Norman Oblate who had been a pioneer in Alaska, showed me over the ruins and proudly indicated how the bomb craters went right up to the walls of the new Basilica but no bomb had hit the structure. Shrapnel had splashed here and there and chipped the stone—no more than that.

The Carmelites were back in their Convent from the refuge they had shared with all the other religious communities of the town, in the crypt of the Basilica. They would never have seen the Basilica but for having to take cover there during the bombardment. Two sisters of St Thérèse came to the grill to welcome me. The first person they asked for in England was Mgr Vernon Johnson. They had had no news since 1940.

I thought I might hear a little about the mystical life but our first discussion was almost entirely about their need for a large tarpaulin. Their little sister, they told me, had protected the Convent well, but naturally a few slates had been dislodged from the roof during the bombardment. With the aid of a garrison sergeant in Rouen the tarpaulin was provided. We conveyed it expectantly but at the second interview the subject

was mainly oil for the midnight office. The whole electrical system of the town was *kaput* and the community could not see to read their breviaries. With the aid of the same garrison sergeant, oil was provided. In 1944 there was no great opportunity to discuss the mystical life.

Traces of the fierce bombardment had all gone when I saw the town the other day. Perhaps the only regrettable relic was a row of ramshackle hutments in which families were unworthily housed. Up at the Basilica *Son et Lumière* draws big crowds every evening. We entered the Basilica to find all in darkness except the main altar. A fierce dialogue was in progress between the Devil on one set of loudspeakers and the Angelic Host, I presume, on another set, reciting and commentating the "our Father". The organ pealed here and there; sudden lighting effects brought arches out of the darkness of the roof and then lost them again. We went out to the esplanade for the second half of the performance. It was a dramatization of St Thérèse's life with more fierce dialogue and sudden lighting effects all along the façade of the Basilica. This time an orchestra supplied effects and the sweep of the *Lumière*, both in width and height, was tremendous. I stood next to some little children who seemed entranced though it was gone eleven o'clock and they should have been in bed hours ago. We agreed the Church should certainly experiment with this contemporary medium.

The sisters of the Little Flower had gone and for all I know Bishop Falaise has gone too. Bright clean buildings have filled in the gaps. The full rhythm of life has been resumed and tremendously accelerated. In Caen, for instance, there seems to be evening Mass every night in the central churches. The Church has shaped herself to contemporary art and living with great vigour. The new church at Yvetot near the Seine is almost a frightening example of contemporary adjustment.

The little children on the beaches playing *boule* had no memories of the warships once riding angrily just off their playground and I'll wager not one in twenty of their elders gave them a thought. The tourist maps have little legends to tell you where troops landed. "Omaha" and "Utah" have been added to the place-names of the Normandy coast. "Gold", "Juno", "Sword" seemingly failed to qualify.

Anyway I had no right to complain. I was revisiting Normandy in a German car. My old friends loved that. You should have heard them...

“CAPELLANUS”

### ONE OF THE PROMISES TO PETER

THE interpretation given to Matt. xvi, 17-19 by Catholics, at least since the time of Stephen I (254-257),<sup>1</sup> has received striking confirmation from the researches of contemporary exegetes. Their findings will be more intelligible if we give an exact English equivalent of the text in the light of its probable Aramaic original:

17. But Jesus answered him,  
 Truly fortunate are you, Simon, son of Jona,  
 for it is from no human source<sup>2</sup> that you can have  
 derived (this knowledge):  
 it must have been revealed to you by my Father in  
 heaven.
18. And I tell you this in my turn, that you are the Rock,<sup>3</sup>  
 and it is upon this Rock<sup>3</sup> that I will build my (new)  
 people of God,<sup>4</sup>  
 so that<sup>5</sup> the gates of Hades will not prevail against it;
19. And I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven,  
 so that<sup>6</sup> whatever you shall bind on earth shall be  
 bound in heaven,  
 and whatever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed  
 in heaven.

<sup>1</sup> A summary of the history of the interpretation of this text is given by O. Cullmann: *Peter*, 1952 (Eng. trans. 1953), pp. 158-70 (henceforth cited as *Peter*).

<sup>2</sup> “Flesh and blood” was a common periphrasis for Man in post-O.T. Jewish literature: cf. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T.*, I, pp. 730 sq.

<sup>3</sup> The word in both instances must have been *Kepha*. To translate the first “*Kepha*” by Peter not only somewhat obscures the sense of the whole passage, but also assumes that the name was given as a personal name to Simon (i.e. Simon Rock) rather than as a substantive name (Simon the Rock).

<sup>4</sup> The English word “Church” does not give the sense of the Aramaic-Hebrew word used. We shall see later that the phrase given here renders the word precisely.

<sup>5</sup> The Greek has “and”. We shall see in a moment that the whole force of the indented lines is to explain the prominent lines. That “*kai*” frequently has this sense in the Septuagint and N.T. is shown by Zerwick, *Graecitas Biblica*, sections 312 sq.

It was not until the last decade of the nineteenth century that the authenticity of the text was called into question. Motive for the doubt was provided partly by the fact that no parallel appears either in Mark or in Luke, whereas the rest of the episode is common to three, or (in the last two verses) two, of the synoptics. Since it appeared that Mark and Luke were concerned to relate the whole episode, it seemed unlikely that they would omit this particular part of it, if it really happened. This motive was reinforced, in so far as Protestant critics were concerned, by obvious apologetic interests. Some Protestant exegetes maintained that the text was interpolated towards the end of the second century in support of the Roman claims.

Today there are few who support the later-interpolation theory. The semitic character of the passage is much too pronounced to allow the possibility of the verses having derived from anyone but a Palestinian Jew (amongst the many semitisms that might be mentioned in these three verses are: "flesh and blood" for man; the metaphor of a rock as a foundation; the rhythm of the passage; the reference to Simon as Bar-Jona . . .).<sup>1</sup> Its omission by Mark and Luke should be acknowledged to be no proof that it is spurious,<sup>2</sup> although, as we shall briefly indicate presently, there are strong reasons for believing that these words were not spoken at Caesarea Philippi, but on another occasion.

But even if it is plain that the passage was written by Matthew, can one be certain that Matthew's ascription of the words to Jesus is historical, and that they were not, rather, a subsequent interpretation on the part of the early Christian community? The four chief objections to the view that Jesus Himself can have spoken the words are shown to be invalid by the Protestant scholar Karl Schmidt.<sup>3</sup> Since it throws much

<sup>1</sup> "The semitic style of expression of Matt. xvi, 17-19 is altogether recognized today." O. Betz, "Felsenmann und Felsengemeinde", *ZNW*, 1957, p. 49. Parallels given in Strack-Billerbeck ad loc. cf. *Peter*, pp. 185 sq. and the warning against exaggeration given by A. Vögtle, "Messias-bekenntnis und Petrusverheissung", *Bibl. Zeitschr.*, 1958, p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. especially *Peter*, pp. 170 sq., and Schmidt, who dubs the contrary contention "too clumsy to be taken seriously" (in his article in Kittel's *Wörterbuch*—henceforth *TWNT*—Vol. 3, p. 523. The article has appeared in Eng. trans. as "The Church" in *Bible Key Words* series).

<sup>3</sup> *TWNT*, 3, pp. 524 sqq., cf. also *Peter*, pp. 184 sqq.

light on the meaning of the text, we shall briefly mention one of these.

This objection, which is the principal one, can be put, summarily, in the form given to it by Loisy: "Jesus announced the Kingdom of God, but what appeared was the Church." Jesus, it is maintained, never could have, never did, speak of His "Church". Such a conception would have been alien to His whole scheme of thought. Consequently the words must have been attributed to Him by the early Christian community, on whom circumstances had forced this unauthentic mentality.

It is difficult to understand how this objection can still be urged, so clearly has Karl Schmidt shown that the very opposite view should be upheld, and that, in the words of Oepke, "the Messias without a Church—such a notion is absurd".<sup>1</sup> The explanation seems to be, in the words of the same writer, that "a conception of 'Church' that would certainly have been foreign to Jesus is, instinctively, set up, and one does battle against this artificially manufactured anachronism".<sup>2</sup> He writes these words with special reference to the leading contemporary protagonist for the passage's spuriousness, Rudolf Bultmann,<sup>3</sup> and he accuses him, as also does Cullmann, of applying to the text his own notion of "Church", a notion that owes immeasurably more to his own religious and philosophic preconceptions than to an attempt to absorb the mentality of a Palestinian Jew of the first century. So fundamental is the acquisition of the Jewish notion of "Church" for the understanding of our text that it will be worthwhile to recall its principal elements here.

By His rescuing them from Egyptian bondage God made the Jews His own people and brought them under His special protection. This relationship was sealed and given form by the Covenant conceded at Sinai. It was this act, which was to find outward expression in the Law, that marked off the Jews as belonging in an especial manner to God and as coming under His particular patronage. Henceforth they were conscious of being a privileged and separate race; and the various epithets

<sup>1</sup> "Der Herrserspruch über die Kirche: Mt. xvi, 17-19, in der neuesten Forschung", *Studia Theologica*, 1948-50, p. 140.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 116.

<sup>3</sup> "Die Frage nach der Echtheit von Mt. xvi, 17-19", *Theolog. Blätter*, 1941.

used to designate this race referred to it as the race of the Covenant, the people of God. This theme of the people-of-God-through-the-Covenant is the central one in Old Testament history, and the one around which all the others turn; and these epithets gave expression to this theme.

One of these epithets was *Qahal Jahweh*, which meant the assembly or congregation of God. It referred to the fact that the Jews had been congregated in order to receive and accept the Covenant.<sup>1</sup> Soon it became, in common with several others, a technical name for the race as such: the race that was the beneficiary of the Covenant. Whenever *ekklesia* appears in the Septuagint it is almost always (there are four exceptions) the translation of the word *Qahal*. The Greek word *ekklesia*, therefore, signified for a Jew his race, Israel, the people of God (to make it clear that it was being used in this technical sense both the Hebrew and the Greek word was usually qualified by "of God", "of the Lord", etc.).

By His choosing the twelve and giving them the power to judge the twelve tribes—setting them up, therefore, as the twelve patriarchs of a new dispensation; by His entrusting them with the same Messianic functions as Himself claimed and vindicated; by His references to His followers as His "flock" and to Himself as its "shepherd" (for the former *Qahal* was called the flock of its shepherd, God); by His claim to be Messiah and Son of Man and Servant of God; and above all by His proclamation at the Last Supper of the new Covenant in His blood, Jesus gave unmistakable signs that He was founding a new people of God. Here we must content ourselves with a brief enunciation of this truth. An analysis of any one of these themes would confirm it.<sup>2</sup>

Moreover we should remember that when Jesus spoke of His "people of God", He would not have expected the phrase to have been understood as an abstract entity. To His hearers, as He well knew, it would have meant a concrete society whose function would be to lead its members in the ways of God in an organized manner: with its leaders, therefore, in their serried

<sup>1</sup> Cf. especially Deut. iv, 10; ix, 10; xviii, 16.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the relevant articles in *TWNT*. For a conspectus of St Paul's consciousness of the Christians being the new Israel cf. Cerfaux, *La Théologie de l'Eglise suivant Saint Paul*, 1948, pp. 38 sqq.

succession, its priesthood, and its laws.<sup>1</sup> His training of the apostles, and His promise to them of great power in His kingdom, must only have served to consolidate this idea in the apostles' minds.

We may now advance to the meaning of the passage; and the first thing to notice is its Hebrew structure, for it consists of three strophes of three lines each (other instances of the construction appear, with modifications, in Matt. xi, 7-9, 25-30), the first line of each strophe giving the theme which is developed in the remaining two lines, these giving either the evidence for (v. 17) or the consequences of (vv. 18 and 19) the strophe's theme.<sup>2</sup> The three themes in our passage, interrelated as they are, are Simon's being truly fortunate, the rock-ness of Simon, and his investiture with the keys. It is important to see the last two lines of each verse as the amplification and explanation of the first line's theme.

We have no space to dwell at length on v. 17. It is the answer to Simon's "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." The fact that a special revelation from God was required for Simon to acquire this knowledge seems to many to confirm the view that Simon had borne witness to Jesus' divine Sonship, and not to His Messiahship merely. It is persuasion of this that is one of Cullmann's chief motives for withdrawing Matt. xvi, 17-19, from the episode in which it is at present included, and in which, as it stands, Jesus is represented as ignoring this stupendous acknowledgement. The point of that episode seems to him to be not so much the acknowledgement of the Messiahship as a *correction* of a false idea of it.<sup>3</sup> In his view of it this acknowledgement by Simon of Jesus' divinity would be better seen as a parallel to John vi, 69.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Remarked by P. Gächter in *ZKTh.*, 1953, p. 333, where he contests Cullmann's notion of a Church that is not "organized".

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Oepke, art. cit., pp. 150-6, and Jeremias, "Golgotha und der heilige Felsen", *Aggelos*, II, p. 108 sq.

<sup>3</sup> Peter, pp. 170-84.

<sup>4</sup> This is his view in *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments* (1957), pp. 286, 287. In Peter and in his art. on Petros in *TWNT*, 6 (1955), he had inclined to attach it to Luke xxii, 31 sq. His latest opinion is attacked by Vögtle, art. cit., p. 92 sq.

In v. 18 Jesus returns Simon's acknowledgement<sup>1</sup> of His divine Sonship by a proclamation of Simon's own office. He had already imposed the name (more accurately, title or nick-name: cf. Abbot Butler's article in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, August 1958, p. 456, n. 1) Kepha on Simon (we do not know when: compare Mark iii, 16, with John i, 42), and the imposition of a name, according to Old Testament and rabbinical usage, signified a promise for the future or a special commission,<sup>2</sup> together with, not infrequently, a new interior disposition and a more intimate relationship with God.<sup>3</sup> The explanation that this imposition had hitherto lacked is now given:

You are the Rock,  
and it is upon this Rock that I will build my (new) people  
of God  
so that the gates of Hades will not prevail against it.

Simon is called a rock, therefore, because he was to be the foundation, the rock-like foundation, on which Christ would build His Church.<sup>4</sup>

The metaphor of building upon a rock was a common one in the Jewish writings of that age. Its basic meaning was the construction of something impregnable and permanent.<sup>5</sup> Thus God was described as throwing a rock into the original chaos

<sup>1</sup> Vögtle (art. cit., pp. 93–103) sees vv. 18, 19 as a separate Logion of Jesus. Neither his, nor any of Cullmann's, hypotheses as to the correct position of vv. 18, 19 alters their sense. We therefore avoid discussion here of this very complex question.

<sup>2</sup> *TWN T*, 6, p. 106.

<sup>3</sup> Mowinckel, *He that cometh* (Eng. trans., 1956), p. 66.

<sup>4</sup> As has been frequently observed the sense of this verse turns on the verbal equivalence of two words. In Aramaic there is an exact equivalence (Kepha-Kepha); while in the Greek the equivalence would be imperfect (Petros-petra). As H. Clavier says (*N.T. Studien für Bultmann*, 1954, art. 'Petros kai petra', p. 101): '(recourse to the Aramaic) is made necessary by the fact that both the pauline and joannine traditions agree on this point: the apostle Peter received the surname of Kephas, the Greek transcription of the Aramaic Kepha, for which, as Jo. i, 42 explicitly tells us, Petros is no more than a translation'. For refutation of the view that the Aramaic did not bear the same word (Kepha) in the two lines cf. *ibid.*, p. 105. For the improbability of the view that the name was not given to Simon by Jesus cf. Oepke, art. cit., pp. 112, 113.

<sup>5</sup> For fuller elucidation of the rock motif cf. Jeremias art. cit. In sum: "a rock should on the one hand bear the sacred House, and give entry to the Kingdom of God, and at the same time defy the powers of Hades" (p. 113). Cf. also *Peter*, pp. 191, 192.

and building the world on it: the rock gave a foundation of consistency and solidity amidst the universal flux of the surrounding chaos. And a Jewish rabbi, using this metaphor, could write: "As God beheld Abraham . . . he said, Look! I have found a rock on which I can build the world. For this reason he called Abraham a Rock."<sup>1</sup> On a former occasion Jesus Himself had used the metaphor in the same sense: a man who wished the house he was building to withstand the onslaughts of the elements must choose a rock for its foundation (Matt. vii, 24-7). More relevant still is the Qumran Psalm recently brought to our notice by Otto Betz. This Psalm describes a citadel built on a rock. This citadel or house represents the community (of Qumran). It is sorely beset by the devil. But God has built this strong citadel on a rock; and this gives to the citadel a guarantee of being able to withstand the ferocious attacks that are being hurled at it by the devil's forces. This assurance is increased by the skill of the building's construction and by the quality of its material.<sup>2</sup> In this Qumran Psalm, therefore, as well as in our verses in Matthew, we hear of the community described as a House, and as built by God (Jesus): just as, in the Old Testament and in post-exilic writings, we hear of God building Israel, and also of Israel as a House.<sup>3</sup> Jesus was now building the new House, the new community, of Israel—and on Simon as its rock-foundation:

*so that the gates of Hades will not prevail against it.*

It is important to remember that this clause is designed to give the reason for Jesus' choice of a rock for the foundation of His Church: the reason why a firm foundation was necessary. Just as in Jesus' parable a rock-foundation is needed in order to prevent destruction by the hostile elements, so here it is the fierce attacks of the "gates of Hades" that make a firm foundation imperative.

The picture that Jesus means to evoke is of two opposing citadels. The House of the new Israel is one of these. And set

<sup>1</sup> For this and other stone-metaphors cf. *TWNT*, 6, p. 95, and Strack-Billerbeck I, p. 733 (where this is quoted).

<sup>2</sup> O. Betz, art. cit., p. 58.

<sup>3</sup> *TWNT*, 5, p. 139, and *Peter*, p. 192.

against it is the citadel of Hades<sup>1</sup> (Hades, not Gehenna, is in point here). By Hades was meant the realm of the dead.<sup>2</sup> It was conceived of as the realm of Satan;<sup>3</sup> and Satan is depicted throughout the Gospels as the chief opponent of Jesus and His work. The firmness of the foundation, therefore, was meant to be a surety against Satan's onslaughts. These Jesus had had to encounter from the very beginning of His public life. He knew that they would have to be sustained by the Church He was founding for as long as it existed in this world. Now, and again later, He promises that Satan's onset would be without success. And the means by which He would fulfil His promise of endurance to His Church was to found it upon a Rock. And this Rock, He said, was Simon.<sup>4</sup>

*And I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven.*

In the third strophe Peter's function is further delineated; and, once again, the first line announces the theme which the second and third lines will develop.

This most expressive line has given rise to two widespread misconceptions which rob it of its true meaning. The first of them is that "the kingdom of heaven" refers to the place where the good go at death. This is not so. The phrase simply refers to the Kingdom, the kingdom Jesus had come to found; and when "of heaven" is added, it is to be explained by the Jewish practice of avoiding the direct mention of the word "God", so that "of heaven" stands for "of God". (The Kingdom is thrice referred to as "the Kingdom of God" in Matthew, and frequently in the other Gospels.)<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In the Qumran literature the enemy was also pictured as a house (cf. Betz, art. cit., p. 53).

<sup>2</sup> For a résumé of the complex and fluid doctrine on Hades held by the Jews of that time cf. *TWNT*, I, pp. 146 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> Hitherto many exegetes have not adverted to the inseparable connexion between death and Satan in N.T. thought. Accordingly they have construed this line as no more than a promise of immortality. In this they have overlooked the purpose of this line, which is to explain the first line of the strophe; and they have given the verb in this line, quite arbitrarily, a passive sense. That Satan, and not merely death, is the opponent in point here is conclusively demonstrated by the Qumran parallels given by Betz (art. cit., pp. 70-2), who shows that the same metaphor (expressed as "the gates of death") is used in the Qumran Psalm he is discussing, and that it stands for the powers of Belial.

<sup>4</sup> Simon himself: not his faith merely, as Luther held (cf. *Peter*, p. 206 sq.).

<sup>5</sup> *TWNT*, I, pp. 582, 583; 3, p. 748.

The other misconception is, of course, that the giving of the keys meant the conferring on Simon of the post of gate-keeper. This, also, neglects the Jewish idiom in which "giving the keys" had for long possessed a well-defined meaning. Thus Isaiah, 700 years before, had described the promotion of Eliakim to steward of the king's palace (a position which gave him complete control of it) by ascribing to God the following sentence:

And I will put the key of the house of David on his shoulder, and he shall open and none shall shut, and he shall shut and none shall open.<sup>1</sup>

And when a Jew spoke of God yielding to no one the key to the rain, or to birth, or to restoring life to the dead, he meant that God retained to Himself absolute power over these things.<sup>2</sup> Moreover Jesus Himself had used an equivalent expression in an identical sense, for, when He referred to the Pharisee's claim to possess the key to the kingdom of heaven, He was referring to their claim to have full authority and leadership over the people of God.<sup>3</sup> It is plain, therefore, that when Jesus declared His intention to confer on Simon the keys of the Kingdom He was investing him with full powers, as His own grand vizier, over the new people of God, which is pictured as a citadel, the possession of whose keys brings full authority over it:

*so that whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven,  
and whatever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.*

We have already noticed that these two lines are intended to be a further clarification and development of the theme of the first line: the absolute power given to Simon over the new community by his investiture with the keys. At the time of Christ the expression "to bind and to loose" meant an imposition by those in authority of their own interpretation of whether

<sup>1</sup> Isa. xxii, 22 (trans. of Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, I, p. 252).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, I, p. 737.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. TWNT, 3, p. 750.

a thing was or was not permitted by the Law, or, alternatively, it meant the power to permit entry into the Jewish community and to expel from it. On another occasion, when describing the powers claimed by the Pharisees, Jesus used the expression in the former sense (Matt. xxiii, 14-26, with Luke xi, 52); but He also used it in the alternative sense when He conferred on the apostles this power to give entry or to expel (Matt. xviii, 17-18). Hence either, or perhaps both, of these faculties were specifically designated here. They were, besides, closely connected with each other in contemporary thought. And perhaps there is an echo, too, of that other power given to the apostles of loosing and binding: "when you forgive sins, they are forgiven, when you hold them bound, they are held bound" (John xx, 23).

In the few words of Jesus we have considered, we have heard Jesus speaking, as we would expect Him to speak, of His Church or people of God. He speaks of it on the occasion of explaining to Simon why He had dubbed him Rock. And the explanation consists in His telling Simon that, in view of the onslaughts of Satan, His Church will need something to enable it to stand firm against the push and press of these assaults. Jesus could have ensured this stability through His own direct agency. But such a course would have run contrary to the most fundamental law of His salvation economy: the Incarnation law, by which the divine power (the numen) works through the frail and human, endowing it with an untold value thereby.<sup>1</sup> Consequently the stability would be provided through Simon. And Simon, as if to empower him to fulfil this role, was to be equipped with full authority over the Kingdom on earth.

When the hostility of Satan against the Church was appeased, then it might be that Simon's task would be done. But not before. And it is only through his inadequate distinction between metaphor and its content that Cullmann can believe that it was merely in his being laid as a foundation (i.e. in the first few years of the Church) rather than in his existence as the

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps no better exposé of this law exists than that given by P. Cyprian Vagaggini, o.s.b., in his *Il senso teologico della liturgia*, Rome, 1957, pp. 230-4.

foundation that Simon's essential service to the Church would be done. For the *raison d'être* of his being the foundation would cease neither when he left Jerusalem nor when he met his death. Satan's fury is not yet extinguished.

If the content of this text is developed in the light of Simon's position among Jesus' followers as the Gospels and the history of the early Church portrays it, and if the other two principal texts on Simon's primacy (Luke xxii, 31 sq., and John xxi, 15 sq.) are regarded, then the justice of the Catholic view of Simon will clearly emerge. This full development is beyond the scope of an article. Enough here to have noticed how clear and expressive is the promise we have examined.

EDMUND FLOOD, O.S.B.

---

### DESERT CALLINGS<sup>1</sup>

CHARLES DE FOUCAUD<sup>2</sup> AND LAWRENCE OF  
ARABIA

THE desert offers its own kind of vocation. Everybody brings there what he finds there, even the beasts. Like the sea, its endless waves of sand can also serve as a mirror—a mirror for Fate or a mirror for the soul. That is perhaps what basically attracted two such different men as Charles de Foucauld and Lawrence of Arabia to try and find their salvation in it. Both were born explorers; both, at some time in their youth, had passed through Jesuit schools, and it might be said that the impact of that early military training predisposed them both towards a soldier's life. If there exists a difference between them, then that is because whereas one represents the tradition of the Christian Hero, the other stands for the tradition of the Classical Hero.

In his classic, *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, the author attempted to give his life a meaning; to explain that the out-

<sup>1</sup> This essay forms part of a book of comparative studies, *The Hound and the Whale*, on which the author is now at work.

<sup>2</sup> His centenary falls in September 1958.

come of his desert adventures were only a fantastic dream to those who saw their beginnings "as an ordinary effort". Was this to imply that he was a man set apart, that from the outset he had been marked for a special destiny? Certainly Lawrence felt that all his moves were bound up with the promptings of Fate—and I use the word Fate rather than Providence because Providence suggests a personal Godhead. Fate, on the other hand, suggests the classical past, and in Lawrence's restless career you have a picture of a modern man subject to the furies of antiquity.

In his *Moroccan Reconnaissance* de Foucauld wrote a classic which is still used as an instruction manual in French staff colleges. There is one observation I would like to quote from it: "The sight of the Moslem faith, of these souls living in the continual presence of God, gave me a glimpse of something bigger and more real than worldly preoccupations." This is a key passage.

As a boy and a youth he had been vain and egotistical; at school and at the military academy of St Cyr he had been idle. His life as an officer was described by contemporaries as a continual movement between cavalry exercises in the morning and champagne and mistresses at night. Yet many of those contemporaries later admitted that from their first acquaintance with him they were aware of hidden reserves. Those reserves were shown by his Moroccan expedition. Disguised as a Jew he set off with his compass and sextant. And what roles that sextant had to play! Sometimes it served as a means of reading the sky, sometimes the future; in Taza it was an instrument against the plague, in Tadla it revealed the sins of the chosen people; by day it could tell and predict the weather, by night—or when none were looking—it took those bearings which were to provide Europeans with nearly fifteen hundred square miles of newly mapped territory. Little wonder that the returned traveller was hailed as "the Greatest Moroccan".

Thirty years later, in 1916, wearing a white Arab robe with a plain cross in crimson stitched upon it, he was assassinated by the fanatics of a desert tribe. At this moment it might have seemed as if his only legacy would remain two big volumes of Moroccan travel, two volumes of translated Touareg prose and

poetry, and a Touraeg grammar and dictionary. To his cousin he had written in one of his last letters: "Tomorrow it will be ten years since I first said Mass at Tamanrasset, and not a single conversion". Yet his influence has grown and grows. . . . Since his martyrdom there has been an awakening of interest in the kind of life he lived. By 1933 over a dozen biographies had appeared and I mention 1933 because in that year was founded the Little Brothers of Jesus. Today they have a rapidly expanding novitiate in the Sahara. They live in small fraternities consisting of three, four or five members, following the ideal set by Fr de Foucauld. Or you might say that they resemble small communities of anchorites, like the early Desert Fathers.

In one of T. S. Eliot's plays, *The Family Reunion*, he has some lines which indirectly refer to them—lines that were prompted by the poet's reading of René Bazin's famous *Life of Charles de Foucauld*:

The worship in the desert, the thirst and deprivation,  
A stony sanctuary and a primitive altar,  
The heat of the sun and the icy vigil,  
A care over lives of humble people,  
The lesson of ignorance, of incurable diseases.

I have quoted this passage because I want to destroy any illusion that you may have that either de Foucauld and his successors—or Lawrence and his followers—were attracted by a technicolor vision of the desert with bedouins charging by on camels, or of tents pitched beside an oasis. These were simply images of the Arab world that they accepted as a Frenchman accepts the vineyards of Alsace-Lorraine, or an Englishman the hopyards of Kent. No, what they both sought in the desert was their inner selves.

Once, in Oxford as a student, Lawrence had sat up all night with friends discussing the ideal existence. He decided that Christ had lived the most perfect life and that he would model his own on it. (In fact one of his brothers did become a missionary in China.) The desert had acted as the homestead of three of the world's greatest religions—Judaism, Christianity and Mohammedanism—and the Arab had called it the Garden

of Allah because, lost in these dunes, a man could be really alone with his Creator. That sense of aloneness was what lured Lawrence, since a bedouin, like a hermit, fights for his life single-handed. The recluse often makes the best kind of commando and had Lawrence lived during the Second World War he would have proved an admirable fighter in guerilla tactics.

If the hermit's fight is principally spiritual while he exists on little more than figs, dates and honey, then the bedouin's fight is a mixture between practicality and spirituality. One day he may be the richest man, the next day he may not have a foal to his name. His communities consist of small groups of ten to fifteen tents. If they are robbed, they make their plaint to other wandering tribes whom they meet; in return they are offered coffee-pots, perhaps a camel or two and some strips of goat's hair-cloth. Then later comes the moment for them to recapture what they lost ten or fifteen weeks before—though it matter not if they be weeks, months or even years. The raid is the sole industry that the desert knows—and a raid is always a gamble. It might sound far-fetched to describe a bedouin's life in terms of those of a broker on the Stock Exchange—and yet it is precisely in these terms that the late Gertrude Bell wrote of the desert dwellers.

De Foucauld was a gambler. He hoped to win converts, and if in his last year at Tamanrasset his score was nil, then he remained optimistic to the end. The odds were seventy to eighty years against Eternity; in taking Christ down to places where "he had never been before corporeally", you could never know what might be the effect in ten or fifteen years—though it matter not if the years be decades or even centuries. In the desert, alone with God and Eternity on your side, the sands of time did not run out.

Lawrence was also a gambler. He wanted an army "without gesture or parade" and he found it in the Arab revolt against the Turks. His cause was freedom, "the second of Man's creeds" as he calls it; and it was a cause so ravenous that it devoured all his strength, a hope so transcendent that it made all other ambitions fade. "Willy-nilly it became faith." Those are his own words, his equation between faith and freedom. Yet freedom, however grand as an ideal, can never become raised

to a position higher than "the second of Man's creeds". The desert could provide an escape, but an escape limited by time. It was as if the furies of antiquity pursued and Fate stood over him, as it had over Oedipus, echoing the same warning:

Then learn that mortal man must always look to his ending,  
And none can be called happy until that day when he carries  
His happiness down to the grave in peace. . . .

Lawrence's world was like that of Sophocles; it was a world without knowledge of the Incarnation. I suppose that you might say that he was a liberal rationalist. Christ's life offered him an ideal because it was the life of a hero; His death by crucifixion had left a shadow like that of other heroes, but a more perfect shadow because He was a more perfect man. In contrast, for de Foucauld that shadow was a ray of sunlight. Shadow needs sunlight, and the better you can understand Lawrence so the better can you understand de Foucauld. Chronologically, the Classical Hero not only precedes the Christian Hero, but helps to explain the difference between them.

Once Lawrence had left the desert he became restless: he joined the air force, then the army. In the barrack-room he sought monastic seclusion, just as in Tamanrasset during the last months de Foucauld had to make his hermitage into a fort. "He remained very much a soldier under a monk's habit," said one doctor who met him. Or as he himself commented: "There's nothing new under the sun. I think, when I look at the battlements of my hermitage, of the convents and fortified churches of the Middle Ages. How the ancient things return, and how that which one thought gone for ever reappears!"

Lawrence, too, had a habit of looking back. As a young man he had been obsessed with the Crusader castles of the Middle Ages and had written a thesis on them. Again, the last fifteen years of his life were spent looking back at the Arab revolt in an attempt to make them immortal in his *Seven Pillars*. How brilliantly he succeeded, and yet what a sad shadow that classic casts! What hopes were dashed, what freedoms lost, what hopes betrayed!

Speaking of Lawrence I quoted from an ancient Greek poet, Sophocles. Earlier, speaking of de Foucauld, I quoted from a modern Christian poet, T. S. Eliot. Perhaps I may now introduce a text from an Old Testament Hebrew singer. "The desert shall rejoice, and blossom like a rose." Indeed, under gunfire, it does blossom. That was an experience common to many soldiers in the Second World War, as it was to Lawrence's followers after their successful raids in the first. Such, at least, is a literal interpretation. . . . In another sense, the Little Brothers of Jesus make the vast wastes of the Sahara also blossom. "One must pass through the Desert to receive the grace of God . . . because there one empties oneself." That advice of a Trappist friend of de Foucauld's had a literal and symbolic meaning for the hermit of Tamanrasset. For he had learnt that revelation is a case of waiting. But Lawrence could not wait; he grew impatient; the vast wastes had taught him to empty himself, but the gap that the freedom of a bedouin's life brought him was too terrifying to contemplate. In the mirror of the desert he found that he, the pursuer, became the pursued. There was no escape from Fate—save in the excitement of speed. Which is how he died, crashing on his motor-cycle. It was the violent end to which all his life had led up, just as de Foucauld's assassination was the fulfilment of what had always been a secret wish: "Think that you must die a martyr, stripped of everything—and wish it were today".

NEVILLE BRAYBROOKE

---

### THE CATHOLIC MISSIONARY SOCIETY

ON the twelfth of June 1914, silk-hatted and frock-coated gentlemen, clerical and lay, and ladies in elaborate hats, drank tea on the lawn of "The Mission House", Brondesbury Park, N.W.6, and listened tirelessly to the rolling Edwardian periods of some of the most celebrated Catholic orators of the day. Fr Herbert Vaughan, surrounded by friends of his family and of the Missionary Society, of which he was superior, introduced Cardinal Bourne, the Bishops of Northampton and

Toronto, Mgr R. H. Benson, Fr Bernard Vaughan, S.J., and the Duke of Norfolk, all of whom exulted in the spectacular achievements of a small group of secular priests. And there, the centre of excited attention, the symbol of the dawning age of the motor-car and adventurous Catholicism, stood the famous Motor Chapel, giving concrete evidence of the truth of the winged words of the orators.

In 1902 Cardinal Herbert Vaughan had invited a group of convert Anglican parsons studying at the Beda College, Rome, to dedicate their energies and their fortunes to working exclusively for the presenting of the Faith to the non-Catholics of Westminster diocese. He nominated Fr Charles Rose Chase, one-time officer in the Hussars and Anglican clergyman, as superior. To them he sent his nephew, Fr Herbert Vaughan, and Fr J. P. Arendzen, who with his degrees from Bonn, Munich and Cambridge universities was to be their consultant theologian. For the next twelve years, whilst caring for the spiritual needs of the Western half of the Westminster Cathedral parish and the parishes of Willesden Green, Saffron Waldon and Hatfield, they gave missions and lectures for non-Catholics in the diocese of Westminster.

In 1909 Fr Herbert Vaughan was sent to live for a year at the Apostolic Mission House, Washington, to study American methods of presenting the truth to non-Catholics. On the death of Fr Chase that year, he returned to take charge of the Society, and extending its activities to the whole of England and Wales, to put into practice the lessons which he had learnt in the States, the chief of which was, "It pays to advertise". There were to be missions for Catholics and non-Catholics together in Catholic churches, evidential lectures in public halls, lectures in towns and villages where there were neither priests nor churches. These three forms of activity were to have two things in common. They were to be prepared for by an intense advertising campaign carried out by priests assisted by a team of layfolk, who were to distribute leaflets, erect placards, publish press-notices and, after the manner of campaigning politicians, visit every house in the district. And always there was to be a great red "Question Box" and written questions were to be answered at every gathering.

But the innovation which caught the popular imagination was the motor-chapel. It was an adaptation of the rail-road-car chapel, used by the American Paulists to bring the Mass to the new towns springing up at the side of the railroads. A team of helpers, mostly "ladies of quality", and Mr J. P. Holland, chauffeur, organizer and reporter, went ahead to the selected district with the lumbering motor-van which Fr Martindale compared to a gypsy caravan. When all was prepared, the missionaries, assisted by such famous volunteers as Frs R. H. Benson, Vassal-Phillips and Nicholson, C.S.S.R., descended upon the quiet villages with their great red "Question Box" and heaps of pamphlets. Mass was said in an inn yard, or a field, but the lectures were given in a hall, and sometimes met with violent opposition stirred up by paid *agents provocateurs*. Always the aim was to establish at least a permanent Mass-centre if not a parish, and funds were raised for this purpose.

At that garden-party in June 1914 Fr Vaughan boasted that in three years £2439 had been disbursed in the founding of permanent missions in thirteen of the fourteen places visited by the motor-chapel which was the centre of excited interest on that sunny day so near to the great cataclysm. Two of the missionaries died heroically and in strikingly similar circumstances, Fr Byles on the *Titanic* and Fr Maturin on the *Lusitania*, and it is on record that both were comforting the passengers and administering the sacraments to the end.

"The Mission House", which had been acquired as a permanent residence for the Society in 1909, served as a military hospital of seventy beds through the war, Fr Vaughan and two priests remaining to care for the spiritual needs of the patients and of the parish of Willesden Green, to publish the *Missionary Gazette*, founded in 1910, and give what missions and lectures they could. In the *Gazette* the Catholic Missionary Society's passion for answering questions was satisfied. Fr A. B. Sharpe wrote the "Question Box" for twenty-two years, being succeeded in this work by Fr Arendzen, who did it for twenty years, till his death.

In the period between the wars a group of brilliant individualists gained great fame for the Society, presenting and defending the Catholic Faith on platform and pulpit and in

print. When in 1918 the *Missionary Gazette* enlarged its pages and called itself the *Catholic Gazette*, its first article was by Hilaire Belloc, entitled "Religion and Civil Liberty". For thirteen years Fr Downey edited it under Fr Vaughan's direction, and when in 1923 the former went to be Vice-rector of Upholland College and later Archbishop of Liverpool, he was succeeded in the editorial chair by Fr Bernard Grimley. In addition to the *Gazette*, Fr Grimley edited from Mission House the *Catholic Times*, over which Fr Vaughan had obtained a controlling interest in 1926. When in 1933 this control was relinquished, Fr Grimley resigned from the Society to dedicate himself entirely to the *Catholic Times*, which he continued to edit till 1936.

On the retirement of Fr Vaughan in 1934 owing to ill-health, Fr Owen Dudley, who had already made a name in the Society as a preacher, lecturer and novelist, succeeded him as superior, and remained in charge till 1947.

All through those between-war years the old work went on. In 1920, at a public meeting in Mount Pleasant Convent, Liverpool, presided over by Cardinal Gasquet, Fr Vaughan gave the aims of the society in terms little different from those he used at the garden party of 1914. It was founded to give missions for Catholics and non-Catholics in Catholic churches, with doctrinal sermons and the answering of questions from the Question Box; to give evidential lectures for non-Catholics in public halls; to visit with the motor-chapel places without priest or Mass and endeavour not merely to make the Faith known there, but to help to establish a permanent mission. He described the methods used:

A party of lay-workers literally take possession of the town, canvass it from door to door, giving out handbills and talking in friendly fashion to the town-folk. . . . We sometimes employ sandwich men, and requisition the services of the town crier to patrol the town every evening before the commencement of the mission.

He had never forgotten the lesson learnt in America, "It pays to advertise". And the Society has never forgotten it since.

In all this work a close liaison was always kept with the Catholic Evidence Guild.

As in the first war, so in the second, the fathers were deprived of the use of "The Mission House", and the Society almost went into suspended animation. The house was blasted by a bomb in 1940. Soon only three fathers were left to represent the interests of the Society and run the *Catholic Gazette* from three different places, Fr Dudley from a newly acquired house in Northwood, Fr Randall from his parish of St Teilo's, Cardiff, and from St Edmund's College, Ware, Fr Arendzen continued to send those incomparable answers for the "Question Box".

The future of the Society remained very uncertain. Then in the Low Week meeting of 1947 the Hierarchy decided to invite Fr Heenan, parish priest of Manor Park (the "Rush Green" of his book), to reorganize the Society.

On November the fifth (the day of fireworks) he, with his old friend Fr Dwyer, of St Bede's College, Manchester, took possession of a newly acquired house at 114 West Heath Road, N.W.3, attached to which was a building which could serve as a convent for the small community of Franciscan Tertiary Sisters (for the Home Missions) who had providentially accepted the work of caring for the domestic needs of the establishment.

Then the pages of the *Catholic Gazette* began to crackle like fireworks with the excited energy of a revitalized Society. The old aims and methods remained the same—missions, lectures, out-door speaking, advertising, and the interminable answering of questions. But under the influence of the ex-parish-priest, the new men were more men of action than scholars. Striking successes attended missions because the missionaries strove to visit every Catholic house in the parish. The new stream-lined motor-chapel, the fifth of an illustrious line, was equipped with a public-address system and library of records of religious music. In the first summer campaign sixty-nine priests spoke from its platform.

In 1949 Fr Heenan organized a general mission for England and Wales. He directed 332 secular priests and 150 religious in the preaching of 1365 missions. Of these 146 were in the open-air and benefited from the help of 200 lay speakers.

But there creeps into the reports of these open-air missions

a note of dissatisfaction. "A juggler or a monkey is what we really need", wrote the superior. The original motor-missioners had insisted on abiding achievements. To preach to the unconverted, interest them, and then leave them to their own devices, seemed inadequate.

Then began the restless quest for a method of reaching the uninstructed and holding their attention over a course of instructions. Each year the C.M.S. organized in London conferences of priests to discuss the work of conversion, and in particular the extension of the "Enquiry Class" in parishes and other centres. One of the most successful of the Enquiry Classes was that run by a young Irish priest at Carlisle, Fr Michael O'Connor. He wrote an article on the subject for **THE CLERGY REVIEW** which attracted much attention. But Fr Fincham, the parish priest of East Grinstead, was making a more remarkable experiment. He wrote a course of twenty leaflets and distributed it through the post to those who had answered his poster advertisements, financing the venture with a small legacy. But in the 1951 conference of priests Fr O'Connor expressed more ambitious aims. He described the American Paulists' technique of advertising in the Press a free book of instructions on the Catholic Faith, which had attracted one million enquiries in three years.

He joined the C.M.S. in 1952 and put forward the idea of an Enquiry Centre which would advertise first in the provincial, then in the national Press and send out a course of weekly leaflets to any who applied. It was quickly realized that none of the American courses of instruction were suitable for the British Isles. In the July and August of 1953, Fr Dwyer wrote the course of twenty-one leaflets which are the goods still advertised in the national Press and which have been eagerly studied and enthusiastically praised by thousands of students of what is now well known as the Catholic Enquiry Centre Course.

Fr O'Connor applied that genius of his for administration, which might be the envy of many a business tycoon, to the organizing and financing of this elaborate scheme.

But the deep instinct in the C.M.S. for answering questions had to be satisfied. Fr Thomas Holland, under the title of Director of Studies, assumed the laborious task of dictating scores of answers a day to the written questions of students of

the Course. He it was also who, having held the right hand of Fr Arendzen as he breathed his last in 1954, had inherited his spirit and the task of writing the answers for the "Question Box" in the *Catholic Gazette*.

For some months the work of the Enquiry Centre was done in the library of "The Mission House". But in 1953 a new wing was added to the house to accommodate it. Now in 1958 further and more ambitious expansion is taking place. The management and development of this daring and brilliant venture is in the hands of Fr O'Connor.

By 13 February 1958, 93,434 people had asked for initial literature, 52,374 had enrolled on the Course and 2770 had notified the Centre that they had been received into the Church after studying the course. Many who become Catholics fail to send notification of the fact.

The vast funds necessary for this work, which is done by three priests and seventeen secretaries and boosted by fifty-nine pictorial advertisements a year in the national Press, are raised by voluntary workers throughout the country who, either as "promoters" or "sponsors", send in monthly contributions.

These funds are entirely separate from those needed for the maintaining of the Catholic Missionary Society with its large establishment and its two communities, priests and nuns. The subscriptions of its Associate Members (the most appreciated of all its donations, because given so lovingly and faithfully often over many years) and the stipends given to the missionaries are in no way adequate to meet all its needs. A collection is taken in its aid in many parishes on Home Mission Sunday, a day of prayer appointed by the Hierarchy for the work of the Catholic Missionary Society and the conversion of England. On the occasion of the first Home Mission Sunday came a telegram of blessing from the Pope and a letter from the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster:

At the Low Week Meeting this year the Hierarchy decided that in future a special Home Mission Sunday shall be held each year throughout England and Wales with the object of praying for the work of the Catholic Missionary Society and for the conversion of our two countries. . . .

Everyone can help, both priests and laymen. We can associate ourselves with the magnificent work being done by the Catholic Missionary Society, by praying that Almighty God will bless their work and give the divine gift of faith to those who are deprived of it.

I trust that Catholics throughout the land will make Home Mission Sunday an occasion for increased zeal and prayer for the conversion of England and Wales for which our martyrs died.

✠ BERNARD CARDINAL GRIFFIN

Archbishop of Westminster

12 August 1948

Not only the old friends and supporters of the Catholic Missionary Society, but many of the converts who come yearly to invigorate the Church in England and Wales, regard Home Mission Sunday as an important day in the year.

*Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.* Edwardian eloquence has gone, with the silk hats and frock-coats of 1914. But the same truth is still preached in churches, chapels and halls throughout the country, for Catholics and non-Catholics, by the successors of those silk-hatted gentlemen. The five successive motor-chapels that lurched round the leafy lanes of England have long since subsided on their tyres. But the Word still goes round the country on wheels, even if now they are those of the red vans of the G.P.O.; and C.E.G. platforms, or the steps of Town Halls, or even sea-walls, take the place of the old pulpit on wheels. And always, in print and in the spoken word, the questions from the "Question Box", are patiently answered.

E. K. TAYLOR, C.M.S.

### BIEL ON THE MASS

#### "UNDISCARDED RELICS OF LATE MEDIAEVALISM"

"**I** WOULD sooner be burnt to ashes," said Luther, "than allow one Mass-churl and his doings, be he a good man or a bad, to be set on equality with or higher than my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." And the papal nuncio, Campeggio,

replied that he would sooner be cut in pieces than let the Mass go. All through the Reformation controversies the debate came back to this one point of the Mass. In England, during the reign of Edward VI, the struggle between Lutheran and Zwinglian views of the Eucharist was carried on with sustained energy. Fr Robert Persons, S.J., in a famous passage of his *Three Conversions of England* (edition of 1603, p. 609), tells, on the witness of Stapleton, Allen and Sanders, what happened at Oxford in those days:

Expectation was notorious in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, where Peter Martyr and Bucer had read now for the space of a year or more, and were oftentimes urged and pressed much by their scholars (whereof the far greater parts in those days were Catholics) to declare themselves clearly of what opinion they were touching the sacrament of the altar and the Real Presence: to wit, whether they were Lutherans or Zwinglians. But they kept themselves aloof and indifferent, or rather doubtful, so far as they could, until the determination of the Parliament should come. Yet was Peter Martyr put into a great strait thereby; for that, having taken upon him to read and expound to the scholars of Oxford the First Epistle to the Corinthians (wherein the Apostle in the eleventh chapter handleth the institution of the Blessed Sacrament), he had thought to have come to that place just at the very time when the Parliament should have determined this controversy.

But the contention enduring longer by some months than he expected, he was come to the eleventh chapter long before they could end in London. Whereupon many posts went to and fro between him and Cranmer, to require a speedy resolution, alleging that he could not detain himself any longer, but that being come to the words *Hoc est corpus Meum* he must needs declare himself a Lutheran or a Zwinglian. But he was willed to stay and entertain himself in other matter, until the determination might come. And so the poor friar did, with admiration and laughter of all his scholars, standing upon those precedent words: *Accipit panem et gratias agens*, etc., discoursing largely of every one of these points and bearing off from the other that ensued. But when at length the post came that Zwinglianism must be defended, then stepped up Peter Martyr boldly the next day and said: *Hoc est corpus Meum*: This is My body, interpreting it, this is the sign of My body; adding moreover that he wondered how

any man could be of any other opinion, seeing this exposition was so clear. Whereas if the post had brought other news, himself would have taught the contrary opinion.

Recent Anglican theological scholarship has come to the same conclusion as Allen and Persons centuries ago. When the late Gregory Dix put forward the claim that Cranmer was a Zwinglian, not only in the *Prayer Book* of 1552, but even in that of 1549, he was greeted with some cries of alarm and despondency from those of a more moderate sort, but a lengthy debate, now summarized in the latest book by Dr Mascall (*The Recovery of Unity*, pp. 115-20), resulted in the conclusion that he was indeed a Zwinglian, even if he made some slight modifications in the views of his chosen doctor. None the less, Dr Mascall goes on to say that although Cranmer may have saddled the Church of England with a Zwinglian liturgy, that church proceeded to interpret it in a sense that was far from Zwinglian. We are given the sad story of Robert Johnson, who in 1574 was put in prison by the government of Queen Elizabeth because he had ventured to distribute to some members of a large congregation in his church wine over which he had not pronounced the words of Institution. He defended himself by appealing to the views of Archbishop Cranmer on the point, but this was of no avail and he died in prison before his sentence was worked out. Certainly the Queen was following a policy of "reversing engines", and had been for some time, but this was not from the most theological of motives, and one may fairly claim that the Anglican church was launched on a wave of Zwinglian fervour.

It is now a common practice to say in defence of the first Anglicans that they were no worse, and no better, than their predecessors the late mediaeval theologians, who had a very imperfect, not to say crude, theology of the Blessed Sacrament. All kinds of charges are laid at the door of Gabriel Biel and the Nominalists, and since their works are not easy to consult, and most trying to read when they are found, being in the Black-letter that was of their time, it is perhaps of some use to set down here what one might with a little scrutiny come to gather from them. Biel wrote an *Expositio canonis missae* which was several times printed in the very early days of printing, but

which has never been reprinted in modern times. It was certainly used by Luther, for one copy of the work exists where Luther's own annotations can be read. Biel himself admits in his work that much of his material came from the lectures of Eggeling of Brunswick which he had followed at Mainz when a young man; it can therefore be taken as representative of late mediaeval theology in general and of the German school in particular out of which the *Devotio moderna* was so largely to come.

Dix and those who have followed him have had much to say about the theories of "real destruction of Christ" which are supposed to disfigure the works of late mediaeval theologians, and so it is refreshing to find in this work of Biel (who is not mentioned by name in the course of Dix's *Shape of the Liturgy*) the following declaration:<sup>1</sup>

Now though Christ was offered once and for all in the plain outward show of His flesh, yet is He offered daily on the altar, veiled under the appearance of bread and wine. He is not offered indeed in what appertains to punishment, for He does not daily suffer wounds and death; but for these two reasons is the making and the taking of the Eucharist deemed a sacrifice and an offering, in that it is a showing and a memorial of that true sacrifice and immolation which was done upon the cross, and also since it effects results of a like kind and is their chief cause.

This sentence seems to remove from Biel the taint of blood-thirstiness in his theology, and at the same time it shows clearly how Luther came to his own theology of the Eucharist. He could not accept the idea of the Mass effecting any result like unto that of Calvary, and so it was that the second part of Biel's comparison of Mass and Calvary must go, but the first part could remain, and therefore the Eucharist was now to be for Luther no more than a showing forth and memorial of the Lord's death.

<sup>1</sup> The edition of Biel used for these extracts is the Basel edition of 1515. This passage occurs in lectio 85 at fol. ccii:

*Quamvis autem semel oblatus est Christus in aperta carnis effigie, offertus nihilominus quotidie in altari, velatus in pane vinique specie. Non quidem quantum ad ea quae poenam important: non enim Christus quotidie vulneratur, patitur et moritur, sed ex aliis duabus causis eucharistiae consecratio et sumptio sacrificium dicitur et oblatio, tum quia illius sacrificii veri et immolationis sanctae factae in cruce representativa est et memoriale, tum quia similium effectuum operativa et principium cause.*

Biel did not proceed according to his own fancy in his account of the two points where the Mass was comparable to the Cross, but put himself under the protection of patristic tradition. He cited Augustine (*de Trinitate*, 4 : 14) for his teaching on the four essentials of any sacrifice and St Bernard and St Albert for developments from this. For the fact that the Mass produced effects like to those of the Cross he argued that, just as the sacrifices of the Old Testament were able, by their looking forward to the Cross (*in eius praevisa virtute*), to work such effects as the expiation of sins, the establishing of peace, the uniting of the heart with God and the rendering of thanks, much more could the sacrifice of the Mass be expected to do in these directions, and that not only for those who receive Communion but also for all present. St Thomas is then quoted (*Summa*, 3a : 79 : 7) in the same sense. One notices a difference of emphasis in this statement, and the difference may well be due to the Nominalism of Biel, but it does not mean that he is thereby forced to emphasize the *realistic* character of the sacrifice of the Mass. He says that the effects of the Mass are *similar* to those of the Cross, whereas to a modern post-Tridentine theologian they would be said to be *the same*, and not merely similar, in view of the decree of Trent (D. 940). Now Biel, with his trouble about accepting a true universal, could not accept that each Mass was in any sense an instance of the one unique sacrifice of Christ, but had to make the relation between the particular Masses and that sacrifice one of similarity only.<sup>1</sup> He does not say this in so many words, but it would be entirely according to the way his mind was working for him to take that view. Certainly it is surprising to find him using the words "similar effects" of the Mass. But whatever his error in doing this, he was moving away from, rather than towards, the notion that the Mass was so nearly one with Calvary that it must needs reproduce in some almost material way the bloodshedding of the Cross.

If one has to look for the real motive why such post-Tridentine theologians as Lessius and Lugo began, each in his own way, to look for a more real immolation in the Mass (for it

<sup>1</sup> Biel would agree, of course, that the Cross and the Mass are *idem sacrificium specie*, but then, what did species mean to him? He does not seem to have thought of the two as *idem numero*, nor was that necessary.

was these theologians rather than any late mediaeval writer who began the quest), it would be found in the desire to counter the insistence of the heretics on the text from Heb. ix, 22 where it is said that without shedding of blood there is not remission. The Rheims New Testament shows what was going on by its annotation on this chapter:

The Protestants . . . perversely and foolishly turn the whole disputation against the sacrifice of the blessed Mass and the priests of the New Testament, as though we held that the Sacrifice of the altar were the general redemption or redeeming sacrifice, or that it had not relation to Christ's death, or that it were not the representation and most lively resemblance of the same, or were not instituted and done to apply in particular to the use of the partakers that other general benefit of Christ's one oblation upon the Cross.<sup>1</sup>

The "most lively resemblance" was thought to be brought out by Lugo's theory of the Mass as somehow lowering the status of Christ and by that of Lessius wherein Christ is held to be conditionally slain by the words of consecration, in the sense that, if it were not for His heavenly status of invulnerability now, the words of consecration would effect a true separation of Body from Blood. These theories have been severely handled in modern times by Billot and La Taille, but there is nothing to show that they were in any way a product of late mediaeval thinking about the Eucharist. They were much more clearly a development due to the onset of Reformation theology. What was afoot can be seen from the Rheims editors' comment on Calvin:

The Fathers . . . called this the unbloody sacrifice, as Calvin himself confesseth, but he answereth them in the pride of heretical spirit with these words: "I pass not for it that the ancient writers do so speak"; calling the distinction of bloody and unbloody sacrifice scholastical and frivolous and a devilish device. With such ignorant and blasphemous men we have to do, that they think they understand the Scriptures better than all the Fathers.

<sup>1</sup> The Rheims editors appeal in a marginal note to Hesychius of Jerusalem in his *Commentary on Leviticus* (PG 93), where the relation of the Mass to the sacrifices of the Old Law is fully discussed.

To return now to Biel, it can be seen that he has no illusions about there being a real immolation in the Mass, for he makes a quite unexceptionable declaration about the matter, claiming to be following Augustine, but in part depending upon one of the writings commonly attributed to Augustine by the Middle Ages:

See how, according to Augustine, Christ in human form and in His proper guise offered Himself on the Cross. Not in this manner is He offered by us every day, but in a sacrament and in a borrowed appearance, our sacrifice being a re-presentation of that which happened long ago. It affects us, indeed, in the same way as if we were contemplating our Lord dying on the Cross.<sup>1</sup>

Augustine did say something like this, for in his preaching on the Psalms he said, dealing with Psalm 21:

Does Christ die as many times as the Pasch is celebrated? Yet this annual remembrance somehow brings back again what happened long ago, and thus it affects us in the same way as if we were contemplating our Lord hanging on the Cross, not mocking Him now but believing. When He was hanging on the Cross He was mocked; now that He sits in heaven He is adored.<sup>2</sup>

All that Biel has done is to transfer Augustine's remarks about the *annual* commemoration of the Passion to the *daily* Mass. That was thoroughly mediaeval, for the pondering of the Passion in all its details was so familiar to men of those times, and it seemed quite natural to them that some details of the Passion should be found there. But he does not expect that there should be a visible immolation in the Mass; he is quite content with the traditional view—still held by the generality of theologians—that the separate consecration of the two elements can be called a mystical immolation:<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lectio 53, fol. cxi: *Ecce, dicit Augustinus, quomodo Christus in propria forma et specie humana obtulit se in cruce; sed ita non offertur a nobis quotidie, sed in sacramento et extranea specie, ut reprezentet ipsa oblatio illud quod olim factum est. Facit enim nos moveri tanquam videamus Dominum mori in cruce.*

<sup>2</sup> *Enarrationes in Psalmos, PL 36, 171.*

<sup>3</sup> Lectio 53, fol. cxi: *Unde ad reprezentandam distinctius passionem Christi, in immolatione huius sacrificii sanguis separatum in calice consecratur, quia in passione Christi sanguis fuit a corpore Christi separatus; et propter hoc in canone plus ad consecrationem sanguinis*

Hence, in order to show forth more clearly the Passion of Christ, in the immolation of this sacrifice of the Mass the Blood is consecrated separately in the chalice, because in the Passion of Christ the Blood was separated from the Body of Christ, and therefore in the Canon of the Mass something more is said at the consecration of the Blood than at that of the Body. . . . Although the words: "As often as ye do this . . ." refer to both consecrations, yet the showing forth of the Passion is more vivid at the consecration of the Blood; for the Body could be present without the Passion, while the Blood cannot be separate without the wounding of the Body, and thus the Body does not so readily show forth by its consecration under appearances perceived by the senses the Passion of Christ. Hence also on Good Friday the priest does not consecrate but simply receives the sacrament under the appearance of bread as spiritual food . . . rather than as a showing forth of the Passion, as would be done by the double consecration under distinct appearances, for Holy Mother Church by the whole office which is carried out on that day recalls the Passion of Christ and the shedding of blood from His holy Body.

Biel or his teachers had evolved a theological explanation for the liturgical facts of Good Friday which might not stand the criticism of modern liturgists, but which in the time was perhaps the best that could be found.

When Biel gives<sup>1</sup> a definition of what he understands by *immolatio*, it is simply a bit of mediaeval philology that he produces. *Immolatio* was the word used for the sprinkling with meal (*mola*) of the animal victim that was being led to the sacrifice. "But all these things, he adds, Our sacrifice fulfils in a spiritual manner, since it is offered in the fire of the Holy Ghost and of charity." When he looks for things to remind him of the Passion at Mass, he is content to find these in the vestments, the altar and its adornment and picture, and in the ritual; he is not bent

*quam corporis additur; Haec quotienscunque etc. . . . Licet ad utrumque referatur, quia expressior est praesentatio passionis Christi per sanguinem quam per corpus (qua corpus esse posset sine passione, sanguis separari non potest sine corporis vulneratione) idcirco hanc Christi passionem per sacramentum sub speciebus sensibilius consecrationem non ita appropriate designat. Unde et in die passionis sex paraceveret sacerdos non consecrat sed sumit sacramentum tantummodo sub specie panis ad refectionem . . . potius quam ad praesentationem passionis quae sit per consecrationem corporis et sanguinis sub distinctis speciebus, quia sancta mater ecclesia per totum officium quod peragit die illo commemorat passionem Christi et effusionem sanguinis de sanctissima sua carne.*

<sup>1</sup> Lectio 55, fol. cxlv.

on making the action of the Mass into a process of carrying out an annihilation of Christ.<sup>1</sup> He seems quite indifferent to the detailed working-out of the comparisons between the ritual of the Mass and the Passion. Thus when he has to say what the three-fold sign of the Cross over the elements means, he gives the various explanations he has found in the sources and leaves his reader to sort them out; it could either be to commemorate the three mockings of Christ, as Albert says, or the three betrayals, or else it could be taken as a sign of reverence for the Trinity, by whose power the change in the elements is produced, as Durandus claimed. Biel is far removed from the modern caricature of a mediaeval theologian who is supposed to have found in the washing of the hands a likeness to the action of Pilate.

When he discusses the *Iube haec perferri* and the heavenly altar, he gives the orthodox alternatives that he had found in Innocent III, namely that what is here offered to God is either the prayers of the faithful, or the Body and Blood of Christ, or else what is mystically signified by that Body and Blood. He seems to prefer the third alternative, saying of it:

What is signified by the sacraments of the Body and Blood is the Church militant . . . and the sense then is: Do Thou, heavenly Father, bid to be transformed into Church triumphant this Thy Church militant and its members, by the hands of Thy angel, Christ Thy Son, who is angel of the great Counsel.<sup>2</sup>

Here he is bringing back the liturgy to its starting point and joining hands with St Paul who said that we, being many, are one bread, one Body. There seems, indeed, to be a need of some such distinction in matters liturgical as the Scripture scholars have between what is typology and what is allegory.<sup>3</sup> Fr

<sup>1</sup> Lectio 21, fol. xl.

<sup>2</sup> Lectio 55, fol. cxlvii: *Tertio, id quod signum est per sacramenta corporis et sanguinis quod est ecclesia militans . . . scilicet "Iube tu, Pater caelestis, perferri in ecclesiam trium, phantem . . . ecclesiam militantem eiusque membra . . . per manus sancti Angeli tui, id est Christi Filii tui, qui est magni consilii angelus."*

<sup>3</sup> Briefly, the sense that was given to a passage of Scripture by God, its principal author, without the human author being aware of its being contained in his words, is called the spiritual sense (e.g. in *Divine afflante*, A.A.S. 35 [1943] 311). It is very often concerned with a type in the Old Testament that is worked out in the New. Allegorical senses are those put upon the words of Scripture by men although God has not put them there.

Jungmann may claim that allegory was brought in (as a means of interpreting the Mass) by Alcuin for the West, but he has to admit that it was known and practised earlier in the East, citing the homilies of Narsai and the *Catecheses* of Theodore of Mopsuestia. But in truth is it not that there may be certain features of the liturgy which by virtue of their Jewish origin, or their institution by Christ or the Apostles, have a further meaning which has been put there by God Himself? One can freely admit that much of what went for interpretation of the ritual of the Mass in the Middle Ages was pure allegory without any basis in the intention of Christ, but is there not a residue which has come to us by a true tradition? If one were to start with the double consecration of the elements, or the mixture of water with the wine (a rite already attested in Justin), one can see that there is no absolute necessity that these usages should exist in a rite of communion, but they have been there from the beginning and it would seem that their meaning has been generally given in the same terms by those who have treated of them. Nor is Fr Jungmann quite correct in suggesting that allegory and typology of the Mass flourished in the East and then began quite independently with Alcuin in the West. The short treatise on the Mass which is found (written in Irish) in the *Stowe Missal*, the MS. of which can be dated to within the years 792-812 and the composition of which must be somewhat earlier, is full of this manner of interpretation:

The fraction on the paten is the breaking of Christ's Body with nails on the Cross. . . . The submersion with which the two halves are submerged in the chalice is a figure of the submersion of Christ's Body in His Blood after His wounding on the Cross. . . .

This is what God deems worthy, the mind to be in the symbols of the Mass, and that this be thy mind. . . .

The claim that these symbols are willed of God could hardly have been made unless there had been some kind of continuity of tradition behind the scribes who engaged on copying the *Stowe Missal*. As I have argued elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> the fact that they call their Canon of the Mass *canon dominicus papae Gelasii* shows

<sup>1</sup> *Vigiliae christiana*, Spring, 1958.

that they had in that part of their work a very old and good tradition to work upon, and it may also be, with the abundance of Egyptian and Syriac material which was somehow available in the Ireland of those days, that they had good traditions here in the matter of interpretation too. What is perhaps of importance here is that the Irish tract says that water is poured into the chalice first and then wine, a use that is not paralleled elsewhere save in the brief description of the Mass given by Justin martyr, and in the remark of Irenaeus (*adv. haer.*, 5 : i : 3) that the Ebionites "reject the admixture of heavenly wine, and with water alone wish to enter into Life, not admitting the Divinity to their mixture". Wine, according to the Irish tract and according to Irenaeus and the Eastern liturgies generally, was the symbol of the godhead of Christ, water of His manhood. The Cyprianic idea that water stands for the people who are thus united to Christ in the Mass is not incompatible with this Eastern explanation and is indeed combined with it in *Stowe*. One has but to see that for human beings generally it is the human nature of Christ that is the bridge to lead them to God, and the uniting of human and divine in Christ was the first step to the uniting of the faithful who worship at Mass with God Himself.

While therefore it is true that some of the allegorizing of the Mass-ritual in the Middle Ages was fanciful, it must none the less be recognized that there were elements in the explanations then given which were truly typological,<sup>1</sup> coming down from an earlier age by tradition, and hence the mediaeval writers are not wholly deviationist but do stand within a true line of development. If some of their explanations are laughable now, the same might be said of some of the explanations produced in more recent times by liturgists,<sup>2</sup> even those of the school which prefers to settle everything by an appeal to common sense and

<sup>1</sup> Patrizi and others have disputed whether there are true types in the New Testament of what is to come in the later history and doctrine of the Church. If this be denied, one would also have to deny that the liturgy of the Church can have such types within it, in so far as it is apostolic and of New Testament times. But the general opinion is in favour of admitting them.

<sup>2</sup> Thus the explanation of *collecta* as a gathering-together of the silent prayers made by the individuals in church during the pause after *Flectamus genua* is favoured by some modern liturgists. How they expect the celebrant to have fathomed what was in the minds of his congregation, let alone his being able to sum it up, is not quite clear.

to what people do naturally when put together in large numbers in a church. Devotions can blossom and die—witness the huge growth of symbolism in connexion with the dividing of the one Host into so many numbered particles as found in Mozarabic and Irish liturgies—but doctrine does not undergo this cycle; it develops but does not wither. It may be that when it is possible to settle what are the truly typological elements in the symbolism of the liturgy the development of doctrine in the matter of the Eucharist will at last be made clear, and in that development it is safe to say that Biel will be seen to have his place.

J. H. CREHAN, S.J.

---

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### RECONCILIATION OF A LAPSED CATHOLIC

Titius was baptized as a Catholic and, though he never received any Catholic education, has always considered himself as belonging, if anything, to the Catholic Church. Because of his ignorance of Catholic faith and practice, when he was called up for National Service, he followed the example of other non-practising Christians in having himself registered as "C. of E." and attended church-parades, but regarded these actions as mere formalities, without effect on his religious allegiance. He now wishes to practise the faith of his baptism. What are the general principles governing the reconciliation of lapsed Catholics, and what, in particular, must be done with Titius? (L.)

### REPLY

Canon 2314, §1: "Omnes a christiana fide apostatae et omnes et singuli haeretici aut schismatici:

- 1.º Incurrunt ipso facto excommunicationem; . . .
- 3.º Si sectae acatholicae nomen dederint vel publice adhaerent, ipso facto infames sunt et, firmo praescripto can. 188, n. 4, clerici, monitione incassum praemissa, degradentur."

§2: "Absolutio ab excommunicatione de qua in §1, in foro conscientiae impertienda, est speciali modo Sedi Apostolicae reservata. Si tamen delictum apostasiae, haeresis vel schismatis ad forum externum Ordinarii loci quovis modo deductum fuerit, etiam per voluntariam confessionem, idem Ordinarius, non vero Vicarius Generalis sine mandato speciali, resipicentem, praevia abiurazione iuridice peracta aliisque servatis de iure servandis, sua auctoritate ordinaria in foro exteriore absolvere potest; ita vero absolutus, potest deinde a peccato absolvvi a quolibet confessario in foro conscientiae. Abiuratio vero habetur iuridice peracta cum fit coram ipso Ordinario loci vel eius delegato et saltem duobus testibus."

The procedure to be followed in reconciling a lapsed Catholic depends largely on whether or not he has incurred the excommunication of canon 2314, §1, either in fact, or at least for purposes of the external forum. It is clear from the general principles of penal law<sup>1</sup> and from the special rules concerning censures<sup>2</sup> that this excommunication is incurred, in fact, only by a *formal* and external act of apostasy, heresy, or schism, as defined in canon 1325, §2, i.e. by a deliberate, gravely culpable, juridically imputable and externally manifested rejection of the Christian faith, of some article of divine and Catholic faith, or of subjection to the Supreme Pontiff or communion with the faithful subject to him. On the other hand, if the law has been externally violated, juridical guilt (i.e. deliberate breach of the law with the requisite degree of knowledge and freedom of will) is presumed in the external forum until the contrary is proved.<sup>3</sup>

The most detailed division of the various kinds of converts which we have so far encountered is to be found in an article by L. Buys, s.j., *De Neo-Conversorum Receptionem in Ecclesiam*.<sup>4</sup> In regard to those baptized in the Catholic Church, he makes a triple subdistinction. (1) There is the baptized Catholic who, educated without any religion, has neither professed heretical doctrines, nor communicated religiously with non-Catholics, nor belonged to a sect, nor even perhaps been known as a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. canons 2195, 2199, 2200, 2202, 2203, 2229.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. canons 2241, 2242.

<sup>3</sup> Canon 2200, §2.

<sup>4</sup> *Periodica*, 1950, XXXIX, pp. 143-55. The author deals with all kinds of converts, not merely lapsed Catholics.

Christian. A person of this kind, he argues, is not a heretic, because he has not the knowledge of the Catholic faith required for its "pertinacious" rejection, nor is he an apostate, for he cannot be said to have receded from a faith he never knew. Apart from instruction, therefore, all that is required for his reconciliation is sacramental absolution of his post-baptismal sins. His subsequent practice will constitute a sufficient profession of faith. (2) There is the baptized Catholic who has been educated from infancy in heresy or schism. His position is equivalent to that of a person validly baptized and educated in heresy or schism. If his only external profession of heresy has been his open acceptance of heretical doctrines, but this has never been more than a mistaken judgement, devoid of the "pertinacity" and "contumacy" required for the sin and crime of formal heresy, he has not incurred the censure.<sup>1</sup> He too, therefore, after due instruction, can be reconciled by a simple absolution of his sins, which requires no special faculty. (3) There is finally the baptized Catholic who, after receiving a Catholic education, has fallen away from the faith in adult age and become a heretic, schismatic or apostate. Such a person must be presumed to be a formal heretic, because he is certainly pertinacious and probably also contumacious. He therefore needs to be absolved from censure. Since it will scarcely be possible for him to avoid scandal unless he abjures his errors and receives absolution in the external forum, his reconciliation must follow the normal form for that forum, as prescribed in canon 2314, §2.

In general, we accept this division of cases and the conclusions drawn from it by Fr Buys. But account must be taken, especially in dealing with case (2), of the principle of canon 2200, §1, whereby guilt is presumed in the external forum, whenever there has been an external violation of the law. A baptized Catholic who has openly professed heretical beliefs has externally violated the law against heresy, whether or not he has ever publicly adhered to a sect. Even, therefore, if he is not *formally* guilty of the crime of heresy, the local Ordinary can and, if the circumstances demand, must require him to be

<sup>1</sup> To be "pertinacious" in heresy, one must know that the doctrine one professes is contrary to the faith of the Catholic Church. To be "contumacious" one must further realize that one's belief is forbidden by the Catholic Church under pain of censure.

treated as a heretic for purposes of the external forum, unless and until he either establishes his innocence in a formal trial (a course so rare that one can ignore it in practice), or is reconciled to the Church according to the prescribed form of the external forum. This procedure will normally be necessary, *a fortiori*, if he has publicly adhered to a sect, or participated actively in heretical worship, because canon 2314, §1, 3° treats public adherence to a sect as an aggravated form of the crime of heresy, and canon 2316 declares those who communicate with heretics *in divinis* to be "suspect of heresy".

The Bishops of England and Wales agreed, at their 1902 Meeting, that each of them would reserve to himself, in his own diocese, the reconciliation of converts to the Church. If, as in some places, this reservation is so worded as to apply only to "neo-conversi", it does not, in our opinion, apply to the reconciliation of former Catholics who have fallen into heresy. In such places, therefore, cases of this kind need not be brought to the external forum of the Ordinary, unless it is necessary to the avoidance of scandal, or the Ordinary, aware of the circumstances, enforces the presumption of the external forum. It should however be remembered that, if the censure has been incurred, it cannot be absolved in the sacramental forum only, without a special faculty from the Holy See.

It seems probable that our questioner's Titius, because of his ignorance, has not incurred the censure for heresy. If so, he could, at least in principle, be reconciled by the mere sacramental absolution of his post-baptismal sins. In practice however, since the presumption of the external forum is strengthened in his case owing to his act of adherence to the Church of England, nominal though it may have been, and since his request for reconciliation has presumably been made in the external forum, we think that he must first be absolved in that forum, like a convert, before being admitted to the sacraments.

#### GRAVE MATTER IN THEFT

In these days of ever-growing inflation, it is difficult for confessors to estimate grave matter in theft with the desirable

degree of uniformity. Can you suggest some sort of permanent yard-stick? (S. D.)

## REPLY

It is well to begin by emphasizing that assessments of grave matter in theft are made with a view to judging the gravity of the thief's obligation to restore, rather than with a view to estimating the gravity of his guilt. His formal guilt will depend on the antecedent verdict of his own conscience which, in view of the fact that thieves are not commonly theologians, nor, we hope, theologians thieves, is unlikely to tally even approximately with the findings of the manualists. When, however, he submits his sin for absolution, whether or not he is found to have been gravely guilty, the confessor must assess his obligation to restore according to the objective value of the property stolen, and, if the amount is theologically grave, must bind him gravely to restore it, under pain of refusal of absolution. At the same time, one must beware of giving penitents the impression that only grave thefts bind to restitution. *Per se*, no uncondoned sin of theft can be forgiven, however small the amount, unless the thief is prepared to restore. The difference is simply that a refusal to restore a venial amount does not, of itself, prevent the absolution of other sins.

"Sins committed against one's neighbour," says St Thomas, "are *per se* to be weighed according to the harm done to him, because it is from this that they derive their measure of guilt."<sup>1</sup> In the case of theft, however, owing to the social as well as individual purpose of private property, there is a twofold harm to consider. A theft not only reduces the individual victim's hold on the resources which he, in particular, needs for a decent life, but it also disturbs that general peace and security of possession which is necessary to orderly social life and the encouragement of honest labour. The former effect is clearly relative to the social and economic condition of the individual concerned. The latter is to some extent dependent on the state of the society in which it occurs, but is absolute in respect of that society. A twofold standard of gravity is therefore required. A theft will be

<sup>1</sup> *Summa Theologica*, 2a 2ae, qu. 73, art. 3.

relatively grave if it inflicts on the individual victim a notable loss which he is reasonably unwilling to suffer. It will be absolutely grave if the amount is such that, irrespectively of whether its loss is gravely felt by the victim, its unjust appropriation must be gravely forbidden in the interests of social security.

In former days, when currencies were tied to gold and were relatively stable in their exchange-value, both standards could be confidently expressed in concrete monetary terms. That is what confessors would doubtless still prefer. But, in these days of constant inflation, it serves little purpose to suggest figures which are likely to be out of date within a year or two of their being assessed. The only practical course for confessors is to keep in mind the criteria on which any such figures must be based, and work out the sums in £ s. d. for themselves, in the light of their own knowledge of contemporary conditions.

Fortunately, there is a substantial measure of agreement among authors as to the relative standard of gravity. Today, as in the time of St Alphonsus,<sup>1</sup> the common opinion reckons it as that amount which would suffice for *a day's keep* of the victim and his dependants according to their condition of life. Since the great majority of men (not only the workers, as some authors assume, but also most of the lower middle-class), in these days of heavy taxation and the grandmotherly State, set their standard of living more or less at the level of their income, the relatively grave sum can normally be reckoned as a seventh part of the victim's weekly income,<sup>2</sup> and up to double that amount if he has no dependants. For old-age pensioners, at the time of writing, it will often be less than ten shillings. For others, it may be anything up to the absolutely grave amount. If, as may well happen, the penitent has no means of knowing the daily or weekly income of his victim, authors somewhat liberally allow the confessor to base his estimate of the gravity of the obligation to restore on the presumption that the victim was moderately well off.<sup>3</sup>

There is less agreement as to the absolute standard of gravity which is required, for social reasons, in the case of thefts

<sup>1</sup> *Theologia Moralis*, lib. III, n. 527.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Vermeersch, *Theol. Mor.*, II, n. 639; Davis, *Moral Theol.* (ed. 1935), II, p. 271.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Heylen, *De Iure et Iustitia* (ed. 4), II, n. 133.

from wealthy persons who would not seriously feel the loss of what they commonly spend on a day's keep, or from corporate bodies to which this criterion is inapplicable. For a long while, authors were content to venture a personal estimate of the amount which, in their region and age, the demands of social security seemed to require to be regarded as grave; but it is clear from a comparison of the widely varying figures suggested during the last century that a period of violent economic change notably disturbs the objectivity of their judgement. Thus, whereas Crolly had reckoned the absolutely grave sum at £1 in the Ireland of 1877, Slater was still holding to that figure in the England of 1928, even though, in the comparatively poorer Belgium of 1914, it was already commonly estimated at fifty francs, the equivalent then of two gold sovereigns.<sup>1</sup>

In 1926, therefore, J. Arendt set himself to work out a more durable criterion which could adapt itself to economic changes.<sup>2</sup> After comparing the sums estimated by moralists during the last two centuries with the exchange value of money in their respective regions and times, he came to the conclusion that their average estimate was equivalent to "the average weekly income of good artisans, good skilled workers, good salesmen, small shopkeepers, who work assiduously but have no extraordinary capacity".<sup>3</sup> Since 1926, skilled artisans have climbed above the lower grades of white-collar workers on the wage ladder, so that Arendt's criterion is not perhaps likely to be as perennial as he expected it to be. Nevertheless, it has been quoted with approval by many writers and can be safely followed by confessors as a rough guide, allowance being made for the fact that an estimate based on the needs of social security does not necessarily keep pace with workmen's wages in a period of overfull employment. One might conclude that, on this reckoning, the absolutely grave sum in this country must now be about £10; but, rather than take this, or any other sum as settled for practical purposes, we think it preferable that confessors should remember and apply a general criterion, such as Arendt's.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, October 1948, pp. 938-9; Genicot-Salsmans, *Inst. Theol. Mor.*, I, n. 507.

<sup>2</sup> *La Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 1926, LIII, pp. 123 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Loc. cit., p. 132.

It should be remembered that, according to the common teaching, the grave amount, whether relative or absolute,<sup>1</sup> must normally be increased to about twice the ordinary sum in domestic thefts,<sup>2</sup> and in piecemeal thefts which coalesce to a grave total (unless they are unified by an initial intention to that effect), and that the absolute standard is applicable to a theft of property belonging to several owners. It should also be stressed that all the above has been elaborated primarily in order to help confessors in their judgement. Not only is it unsuitable matter for public instruction, but it could well have harmful effects if it were broadcast as a guide to personal conduct.

L. L. McR.

#### THE SINGING OF THE EPISTLE

The common practice for the singing of the Epistle at high Mass is that the subdeacon, having received the book at the foot of the altar, goes to the centre, genuflects on the step, returns to the foot of the altar steps and there sings the Epistle. Is this correct? (M. N.)

#### REPLY

It would seem not. The rubric (*Ritus Servandus*, vi, 4) directs the subdeacon to genuflect to the altar *in medio* and go *ad partem Epistolae contra altare* to sing the Epistle. At its close he is directed to genuflect again *in medio* before going to the celebrant for his blessing. The only direction that the Ceremonial of Bishops (II, viii, 40) gives is that the subdeacon sings the Epistle either *a latere sinistro altaris* (i.e. the left as one looks down from the altar) or in the ambo. Accordingly, no rubric directs the subdeacon to sing the Epistle at the foot of the altar steps in the same place where he had been standing for the Collect, and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Vermeersch, *Theol. Mor.*, II, n. 645.

<sup>2</sup> Not however in thefts by servants of property on which their masters usually keep a close eye, e.g. money. Cf. Noldin-Schmitt, *Theol. Mor.*, II, n. 417.

there are several reasons why he should not do this but should sing the Epistle at a distance from the altar? (1) Why these genuflexions before and after the Epistle. If the subdeacon does not leave the immediate ambit of the altar, they are quite meaningless. (2) Historically the Epistle was sung away from the altar, like the Gospel, and would be sung, naturally, nearer the congregation for whom it is chiefly intended. Why then should *in medio* be interpreted as meaning at the foot of the steps at the Epistle corner? (3) The rubric regarding the singing of the Gospel says also that it is sung *contra altare*, and no one interprets this as meaning at the foot of the steps on the Gospel side of the altar.

The common practice of singing the Epistle at the foot of the altar steps—which is, happily, being gradually eliminated—and facing the altar instead of the people, seems to have arisen from some of the unfortunate effects that the celebration of a private low Mass has had in the course of time on the ceremonial of high Mass. Naturally enough when priests celebrated Mass in a private chapel with practically no congregation present they did not turn round to read the Epistle. In the future reform of the rubrics there is quite a possibility that the subdeacon may be directed to sing the Epistle at least partly facing the congregation (partly, in order not to turn his back fully on the bishop at his throne, or on the celebrant); he may at present face the people if he sings the Epistle from an ambo where this is the usage (*Ceremonial*, II, viii, 40).

#### THE INTROIT

Must the Introit of a Mass be always taken from a psalm?  
(J. V.)

#### REPLY

Nearly all the Introits of the Roman Missal are taken from the book of Psalms, because originally the Introit was a processional chant, and the whole or at least several verses of a psalm were needed to accompany the cortège on its way to the

altar. When low Mass became the normal way of celebrating Mass the Introit was abbreviated, and so only one or two verses of a psalm remained, with an antiphon often taken from the same psalm. That is the reason why it is sometimes necessary to refer to the entire psalm from which the Introit is taken to find out why certain verses were chosen for certain days. But, of course, there are several Introits, drawn, at least in their opening part, from other books of Sacred Scripture. For example, the book of Isaias supplies the Introit for the second and fourth Sundays of Advent; for the second and third Christmas Masses. The New Testament supplies texts for Introits, e.g. the third Sunday of Advent, the feast of the Holy Name of Jesus. But more interesting still are Introits whose main text is non-Scriptural. The familiar *Requiem* text is from an apocryphon, the fourth book of Esdras; so is the Introit of the Tuesday of the Pentecost octave. *Salva, sancta Parens* of Masses of our Lady is from the fifth-century Christian poet Caelius Sedulius—an extract from his *Carmen Paschale*—two of whose poems occur in the Roman Breviary (*A solis ortus cardine* in the Lauds of Christmas, and *Crudelis Herodes* of the Epiphany Office). The well-known Introit *Gaudemus* of some great feasts is attributed to St Gregory the Great (*d. 604*), and was, in the first instance, proper to the feast of St Agatha (5 February). At the great feasts that were celebrated before the reign of Pope Celestine I (422-32)—to whom the introduction of the Introit is, doubtfully, attributed—the Introits were not taken from the Psalter (e.g. on the feasts of the Epiphany, Maundy Thursday and Pentecost). Sometimes the Introit text is taken from the Epistle, and this link between the two is often an indication of the great antiquity of the Mass in which it occurs.

J. B. O'C.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The End of the Modern World.* By Romano Guardini. Pp. 133. (Sheed & Ward. 8s. 6d.)

This is an important book. Romano Guardini's writing comes like a breath of fresh air amid the turgid thinking of today. Here, one feels, is a man who has taken the trouble to think deeply, and who prays. He is not bound down to the conventional pattern, but gazes around him, forward and backward, with a wider, freer and wiser vision. He is always concerned with the basic truths, but is not obsessed with the past, with tradition. His judgement is mature, and his balance sufficient to enable him to stand back from the general maze. Because he can do this, he is more able than most to see a pattern and to hint at some future goal.

Although the title of the book might seem apocalyptic, Guardini is not so in the ordinary sense. But he does maintain the end of the "modern world", as he calls it, and the beginning of an age which is to be typified by "mass man"—a term he uses, not in a derogatory sense, but as a type—"who stands at the extreme pole from the autonomous" . . . "it simply designates the man who is absorbed by technology and rational abstraction". This concept leads him to some startling ideas upon the nature of this new "mass man", together with a preview of the destiny which must be his in the world to come.

What suggests this line of reasoning? Quite simply, Guardini sees all past history as building, one period upon another. Classical antiquity saw the world as a limited sphere. Classical man never went beyond the universe, which was the whole of reality to him. Not even his ideas of the divine absolute transcended the universe: "The world, reality in its fulness, encompassed not merely the empirical and the historical; above all it encompassed the spiritual. The Divine was identified with the primordial, with a mystery which was one with his world. Man was in the universe, but in turn, the universe was in him."

From this, the world which emerged in the mediaeval period continued to develop, but it maintained the idea of the limited universe. However, Christian Revelation itself transcended the universe to pierce to the Godhead. God now was a tremendous reality—but he was still in existence in a definite place, which itself enclosed the world. For mediaeval man had not pierced the universe with science. He lived by what he saw. His architecture stretched to the skies, his whole way of life focused upon God, and led beyond the earth only to be completed in God.

Then, says Guardini, with the development of the Copernican and Newtonian Universe, this classical and mediaeval world was rejected. At the same time, and because of these developments, the acceptance of revelation became more difficult. Man focused no longer on God, but now on nature. He brought the infinite down to earth, and set out to discover the infinite by progress, exploration and science, believing in the infinite scope of the mysterious world he was opening up.

But in recent years, this, too, has been discarded, and nature herself has been rejected. For, the idea goes, "mass man" no longer accepts nature except in so far as it can be exploited and humanized by man. Nature itself is in need of leading to health. It depends, in a sense, for its salvation upon the ministrations of science. So that nature has to be trained by mass man into something like a mechanized image of himself.

Far from wishing to return to the more godward days of the past, Guardini carries his analysis this far in order to make the point that Christian hope lies not in the past, but in the future. But for this, it is necessary to take the present, and use the mass power which is coming into being. He is not pessimistic. His realism, however, calls for a new spirit of heroism in Christianity, greater even than in the past days of the martyrs. As he puts it, the modern world, in rejecting Christ, has got to learn to live honestly without Christ, and without God revealed through Him. The distinction of Christian and pagan has to become starkly black and white. The pagan: "will have to learn what this honesty means. Nietzsche has already warned us that the non-Christian of the modern world has no realization of what it truly meant to be without Christ. The last decades have suggested what life without Christ really is."

Here is a book which needs to be read, and to be read thoughtfully for it is well-thought itself. It may cause disagreement, it might cause gloom. But it will surely reveal some underlying truth, which may help us with Guardini in a positive search for orientation. In any case, I am sure it should be widely read by the clergy.

*The Yoke of Divine Love.* By Dom Hubert Van Zeller. Pp. 238. (Burns Oates. 16s.)

It may be considered wrong for a person to review a book about religious perfection, when he has never had any personal experience of the life of a religious. At least it well could be. But at the same time, there has grown up a tradition in past years in the other direction, that is of religious giving retreats and acting as directors for lay people and for secular clergy. There is a considerable difference

between the two situations, perhaps, but a similarity. If it is possible for a man living by a rule to give practical advice, to criticize life in the world, and the way it is lived, without too far imposing something of his rule outside his order, then, I suppose, it is possible for a secular to criticize (in the proper sense) the religious life. For this present book is no more and no less than an exposition of religious perfection, especially with an eye to Benedictine perfection.

Fr Van Zeller has written too many books to need introduction. In some ways, by this time, it is hardly worth writing a review, because so many people have already made up their minds whether they like what he says, and read what he writes, or not. Some people feel he has written too much! Personally, I find that he is always stimulating and to the point; his ideas are fresh, his approach often from a new angle, and therefore sufficient to spark off a response. But, frankly, I cannot keep pace with the stream, if more than one comes out in a year!

However, having got that off my chest, I must say, from my non-regular background, that I did benefit greatly from reading *The Yoke of Divine Love*. It is very worth while, for it puts the ideal of monasticism clearly and without any beating about the bush. It is a vastly high ideal. It is faced as such. Hence it is a yoke, but a yoke, properly undertaken, which is both sweet and light; a yoke badly fitted, which becomes an irritant and sometimes unbearable. It is important today to be completely honest in facing such a fact. The author is, because he faces what every clear-sighted and unbiassed person must recognize, the fact that the ideal and the practice can be poles apart. "Religious must find Christ in their submission, in their prayer, in their community life. To the extent that they seriously attempt this, they are true religious; to the extent that they do not, they are false."

Fr Van Zeller makes a threefold division of his book, harnessing his ideas to the threefold yoke of the monastic life, or religious life. These yokes are the religious life itself, prayer, and the community. He writes from inside, from a considerable number of years of experience. He gives the impression of this being a mature consideration, a putting down on paper of the thoughts and difficulties and joys which he has known as a monk. From this there comes the mixture of the ideal, and the sense of difficulty, the reality of the cross. He gives the impression of realism. The beauty of the ideal leads him on, perhaps more starkly than some of his brethren would appreciate; and yet he is aware of the personal difficulty, and does not simply paint a beautiful picture.

I think this is a considerable book, for one outside a monastery.

I do not know what the reaction would be from inside—or that it would necessarily be the right one—no man is a prophet. . . . But I should not hesitate to recommend it to religious as a self-examiner. And it would, to me, seem a good book to put into the hands of a young man who thought he was called by God to the cloister, and needed a little more clear thinking before presenting himself.

*The Book of Miracles.* By Zsolt Aradi. Pp. 296. (Longmans. 18s. 6d.)

THE dust-cover of this book tells the reader that for the first time some of the difficulties of mystical phenomena, the power of the devil and so on, appear in a form which can be read by the average person. This immediately gives the impression of a field so wide as to be almost impossible to cover. And as we read on into the text, this general impression is emphasized. It is extraordinarily hard to deal with deep matters, capable of so much false representation, in so limited a space. Not so long ago, a very fine and fairly comprehensive work was brought out—the collection of Fr Thurston's papers on these various subjects of the occult, physical phenomena, inedia, bilocation, stigmatization and the rest. Perhaps *The Physical Phenomena of Mysticism* was too intense for many readers, but it was worth getting down to study it.

The present book draws largely on other sources for a discussion of the power of the devil, apparitions, and miracles. The difficulty which I felt in reading it was the mass of information which had been crowded into so small a space. By the end of the book, I was positively reeling at the succession of miraculous occurrences. Of course, this may have been the right reaction, and it may be what the average reader needs. But it is difficult to pick the wheat from the chaff. Not only are there sections on Lourdes and Fatima, which necessarily are confined to a few pages, and therefore are of little value, but there is also room for Knock, Catherine Labouré, Beauraing, the Weeping Madonna of Syracuse, and even the reported vision of our Lord to the present Holy Father.

The effect is a lack of light and shade, and to me a sense of spiritual indigestion. But I was probably partly given this feeling, because the only living instance quoted of which I have any personal knowledge was inaccurate and over-written—at least so far as I know. I refer to the space given to Padre Pio da Pietrelcina. The author states Padre Pio's "hands are wrapped in absorbent cloth to protect the altar cloth", and that "half the palm of each hand, however, is visible and it can be seen, even from a distance, that the wounds are bleeding profusely". I can only say that on the seven or eight occasions over the past ten years when I have been to Padre

Pio's Mass none of these details was accurate . . . no absorbent cloth, and no profuse bleeding, certainly! And this naturally makes one suspicious of the sources, and of other accounts from other places.

The book, however, would be an eye-opener to anyone who felt that the age of miracles had passed. It is well illustrated with photographs of many of the places concerned, or pictures of the saints who are referred to in the text.

M. H.

*Fast and Abstinence in the First Order of St Francis.* By Rev. Jordan Joseph Sullivan, O.F.M.Cap., J.C.L. Pp. xiii + 133. Canon Law Studies, n. 374. (The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C. \$2.00.)

In addition to the fasting and abstinence imposed on the faithful in general by the common law of the Church, members of the First Order of St Francis are obliged by their own rule to observe a special "Lent" from All Saints to Christmas and to fast every Friday. The principal object of Fr Sullivan's doctoral dissertation is to distinguish between these two forms of obligation and to discover how far the norms of the common law and the dispensations and indults granted by the Holy See or local Ordinaries in respect of the common law are applicable to the Franciscan obligations. His study of the problem is competently executed and clearly written, and, since other religious orders likewise have special fasts of their own, it ought to be of practical value to others than Franciscans.

*Conscience morale et loi humaine selon Gabriel Vazquez.* By L. Vereecke, C.S.S.R. Pp. x + 161. Bibliothèque de Théologie, série II, Théologie Morale, vol. IV (Desclée et Cie, Tournai. Price not stated.)

The object of this monograph, the work of a professor at the *Academia Alfoniana* in Rome, is to throw light on the moral obligation of purely human laws by following the great Vazquez in his effort to construct a coherent and sound doctrine on the subject, after it had been thrown into confusion by the vogue of nominalist ideas. It is a work of analysis rather than synthesis, and primarily historical, though with important doctrinal conclusions.

After an examination of the situation created by Gerson's doctrine, that no human law could bind in conscience except in so far as it stated a divine law, we are shown how Vazquez confronted and refuted it. Like others of his contemporaries, he re-asserted and proved that every just human law, if it is a law at all, must bind in conscience. Unlike them, however, he placed the source of this obligation, not in the will of the legislator, but in the exigencies of man's

own social nature, the legislator's commandment being no more than an essential condition of this intervention of the natural law. We then see how he reached his conclusions as to the criteria by which a genuine precept of law is discerned, how he misunderstood Cajetan on the way, and how he reacted against the common doctrine which made the gravity of the obligation dependent on the legislator's will, insisting, consistently with his basic principle, that it depended on the gravity of the matter alone. Two further chapters analyse his doctrine on the power of the human legislator in regard to internal and heroic acts, and then the author sums up by surveying the theological background in which Vasquez worked and the part he played in the history of moral theology. The problem of purely penal laws is omitted as irrelevant. The special interest of this scholarly work lies in its display of the vast amount of debate that lies behind a small section of our modern manualist doctrine which we tend to take for granted.

*Morals and Money.* By Rev. Anthony Hulme, D.D., D.C.L., B.A. Pp. 174. (St Paul Publications, London. 25s.)

MONEY and sex are probably the chief preoccupations of the bulk of mankind; yet relatively few ever pause to consider the real meaning and purpose of either, and fewer still correctly solve the problems they present. Dr Hulme does not pretend to have solved the practical moral problems arising out of our modern financial system. He is content to show that there is a problem and that it lies chiefly in the creation of interest-bearing debt by the banks, which, by lending vastly more than is backed by their capital assets and real deposits, charge for something they do not surrender and, in effect, mulct the community by an equivalent depreciation of its currency.

The first part of his book gives a sound and well-documented analysis of the teaching of Scripture and ecclesiastical tradition on the lawfulness of charging interests on loans of money. The second part, which deals with modern critics of the current financial system and is, in the main, a summary of the criticisms made by Professor O'Rahilly, Professor Soddy and Christopher Hollis, is less satisfactory. The author has expressly preferred to let the critics speak for themselves in a series of interwoven quotations, rather than to digest the substance of their criticism and present it in his own words. Whatever the presentation may gain in authenticity by this method, it loses in clarity and coherence, because the tissue of truncated quotations is almost inevitably disjointed and repetitious. The last two chapters sum up the position and collate it with the teaching of modern moral theologians. The author offers little hope of an early

remedy to the ills he has outlined, because, although it would be a simple matter for the State to reserve to itself the creation of credit, any such move would be bitterly resisted by vested interests which are as elusive as they are powerful.

*Au cœur de la morale chrétienne.* By O. Lottin. Pp. 207. (Desclée, Tournai, 1957. Price not stated.)

DOM LOTTIN is one of the new moralists, though in no sense a preacher of the "new morality". He regards the traditional manuals *ad usum confessariorum* as being, at best, a necessary evil and wants to see moral theology rehabilitated as a sacred science by means of a return to its Scriptural sources and a recovery of its supernatural ideal of charity. Not that he is an out-and-outer among the new moralists. Sacred Scripture, he readily admits, is not a sufficient basis in itself for a scientific theology; it needs to be completed by the authoritative teaching of the Church and the reasoning of theologians. Charity, bond of perfection though it is, cannot supplant the moral virtues; despite its common title, *forma virtutum*, it is not their substantial form, but rather the efficient cause which moves them to their final end. What is needed therefore, he claims, is not so much a change of doctrine as a change of emphasis, from the negative to the positive, which will make it clear that the pursuit of perfection is itself a moral obligation.

This is not the first time that he has endeavoured to re-write the basic principles of moral theology. The present work is indeed, in the main, a résumé of his *Morale fondamentale* (Desclée, 1954), modified and simplified to suit the capacity and needs of beginners in theology and educated layfolk. It covers the substance of the material handled by the manualists in their treatises *de actibus humanis*, *de conscientia*, *de legibus*, *de peccatis*, and *de fide, spe et caritate*. It differs from them in arrangement and emphasis, but the doctrine is much the same. No one, after all, can afford to ignore the minimalists who, like the poor, are always with us. It cannot be otherwise in a Church which, while holding up to all the imperative ideal of perfection, has never sought to exclude the imperfect.

*The Provincial Council of Manila of 1771.* By Rev. Pedro N. Bantigue, J.C.L. Pp. xiv + 261. (The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C. Canon Law Studies, No. 376. \$2.00 paper-bound.)

THE value of this doctoral dissertation is almost entirely historical. The acts of the Provincial Council of Manila of 1771, though canonically void through lack of subsequent approval, royal or papal, shed considerable light on the politico-religious situation then prevailing

in the seven thousand islets and islands of the Philippines, scene of the most remarkable missionary achievement of the Far East. After a historical introduction, the author publishes, for the first time, the full text of the Council's decrees and follows it with a commentary on their most significant section, *Actio II, De Episcopis*. Hispanic specialists and missiologists will doubtless be grateful to him for his industry.

L. L. McR.

*Initiation à la Liturgie*. By I. H. Dalmais, O.P. Pp. 221. (Desclée de Brouwer, Paris, 1958. 105 Belgian francs.)

THIS volume is the eleventh of the *Cahiers de la Pierre-Qui-Vire* published by Desclée; its author a professor at the Institut Supérieur de Liturgie of Paris.

The first part of the book deals with the Theology of the Liturgy: the nature of the Liturgy as an act of the Church and "the mystery of worship". The second part treats of the content of the Liturgy: its constitutive elements, the principal types of liturgical celebration, the development of the Western Liturgy, and the different liturgical families of both the Western and Eastern Church.

Fr Dalmais entitles his book an initiation into the Liturgy, which suggests that it is a simple book written for those who have little or no acquaintance with the nature and meaning of the Liturgy. The title is misleading. This book, especially in its earlier chapters, is such difficult reading that it will be understood, if at all, only by those very well versed in liturgical lore.

*Our Mass*. By Mgr Chevrot. Translated by J. Holland Smith. Pp. 241. (Challoner Publications, 1958. 21s.)

Books on the Mass keep pouring from the printing presses of the world, and, happily since the birth in the present century of the scientific study of the rite of the Mass, they are for the most part satisfactory, unlike those of an earlier period. Some of these books, written by liturgists of international repute, treat of the Mass at great length and very deeply, and their preparation involves years of intensive, original study of the almost innumerable sources of information on the Mass. Such books become classics, and from these long and learned tomes shorter and more popular books are made ready to place at the disposal of priests and layfolk the fruits of the labours of specialists—the process that the French call *vulgarisation*. Mgr Chevrot's book is one of these. It embodies a series of conferences which he gave to his parishioners of the church of St Francis Xavier, Paris, and so is a book which priests will find very useful in preparing similar instructions for their own flocks. Against a back-

ground of erudition its author explains in a simple, popular way the historical development of the Roman rite of the Mass, adding some theological explanations and ascetical reflexions. The exposition is sufficient for his purpose, but there are a few rather striking lacunae, e.g. he does not explain the actions accompanying the final doxology of the Canon (*Per ipsum*, etc.), nor deal sufficiently with the rite of the Fraction or the Commingling—admittedly not easy to do in a brief treatment of the ceremonial of Mass, yet necessary.

The translation from the French is competently done, but it seems a pity to continue the use of archaic words like *ye*, *unto*, *vouchsafe*, *cometh*, etc., which modern translators of liturgical texts eschew. On p. 67 the "poetess Prudence" should be "the poet Prudentius", and the English of "Gaudence" is "Gaudentius"; the letter "P" before Dr Adrian Fortescue's name is not the initial of his baptismal name, but stands for "Père". The date of the "Missal of the Council of Trent" (p. 161) should be 1570 (the author's error).

J. B. O'C.

*Standing on Holy Ground.* By Robert Nash, S.J. Pp. xii + 140. (Gill & Son, Dublin. 12s. 6d.)

CENTURIES before Europe was civilized, Jerusalem was a famous city and the capital of a great nation. Its civic influence has almost disappeared, but its historical importance can never decline. As Rome is the heart of christendom, so are the Holy City and the Holy Land unique in the minds of Christians as the cradle of their faith and the earthly home of its Founder. Fr Nash emphasizes this in every paragraph of his interesting book, the record of an Irish pilgrimage. With the Scriptures for his guide he takes his readers to the Holy Places, making the Gospel story live again by focussing attention upon the spots made forever sacred by the living presence of the Lord.

Although this is primarily a spiritual book, it has many a marginal note on political matters, the result of an intelligent traveller's observation. The author speaks of the four hundred and fifty thousand Jews in Tel Aviv, all absorbed in pleasure and materialism. He does not say it in so many words but he gives the impression that his affection inclines rather to the Arabs than to the Jews, as is the case with so many who visit Palestine. The Jews are stubbornly anti-Christian; the Arabs are at least polite and well behaved to the Christian visitor. The author remarks upon the poverty and squalor within a stone's throw of main thoroughfares and fashionable houses; but the saddest sight that met his eyes is the shocking condition of the great churches and other sacred buildings. This is what Mr Christopher Hollis rightly calls "the scandal

of the Holy Places". It is well for the general reader to know these things.

*A Tribute to Evie Hone and Mainie Jellett.* Edited by Stella Frost. Pp. xi + 77. (Browne & Nolan, Dublin. 15s.)

FRIENDS and fellow-artists, men and women of distinction, contribute the articles which form this symposium of homage and appreciation offered to Evie Hone and Mainie Jellett, two Catholic Irish ladies of high artistic achievement. Each of them was devoted to the other, and both were completely dedicated to their arts.

The two friends had an almost identical artistic ambition, Evie Hone fulfilling it in her church windows, and Mainie Jellett on her canvases. Trained in and influenced by the modern French impressionist school, these two artists were abstract rather than figurative in their work. Their purpose was not primarily to depict something, but—in the words of Evie Hone herself—"to arrange form and colour in such a way as will produce an effect of beauty, a living organism with rhythm and balance". She was not thus speaking directly of her own work, but of that carried out at Gentilly by another artist in glass, Monsieur Gruber. Her words, however, do describe her own achievements and those of Miss Jellett. Not everyone will accept Miss Hone's drawing and design, but few will withhold their admiration from her windows, or deny their dignity, their deeply religious significance and their colourful beauty.

Some well-produced plates will prove helpful to readers of this book in understanding the work of the two artists, but not every reader will easily become an admirer of it. When people have accepted, during their maturer years, traditional modes of artistic expression, it is difficult to accommodate their ideas to newer and widely differing forms: and not all the younger generation lean towards impressionism. An Eton friend of the present writer has never felt quite happy before Evie Hone's now so famous College Chapel Crucifixion. Here is a book concerned with non-representational, non-figurative art; that which conveys the artist's ideas mainly in an abstract fashion, by line and colour harmonies. Even if the open-minded and careful reader does not accept all that is here offered to him, he will certainly learn much from this tribute to two brilliantly accomplished artists.

L. T. H.

*The Beda Book.* An anthology. Pp. 300. (Sands & Co. (Publishers) Ltd. 16s.)

THERE is a great charm about *The Beda Book*.

I suppose I review it from an unfair angle, because I know the Beda through and through, and greatly admire the ideal for which it was founded, and the spirit developed in it by the present outstanding Rector, Mgr Duchemin.

But to many people the question is the one put and answered in Mgr Duchemin's contribution to this anthology "What is the Beda?" The laity may never have come across its title or its work, and a considerable number of the clergy have only a poor idea of what it is and does. It would almost be fair to say that more people know it from a joke about its rules than from the true purpose for which it was founded, namely the training for the priesthood of convert clergy, which was later extended to include "late vocations".

This volume represents collected essays which have been written over the years for the *Beda Review*. Naturally it is only a selection, chosen to give as wide a view as possible of the background to the college, and the spirit and personality of its students. Many of those whose writings are here republished have since been ordained and some have risen to high places within the Church. But because the common link is writing for the *Review*, and the authors are from such a variety of callings, the quality of the writing varies. This in itself provides something of an extra charm, for, as Mgr Duchemin says, "Almost every calling and profession is represented; as well as the Protestant ministry, soldiers, sailors, doctors, lawyers, school-masters, business men, craftsmen, musicians and artists all meet on the common ground of service in the vineyard of the Lord." And so their individual writing gives a key to the qualities and experience which each of these older vocations brings to his studies, and eventually by God's grace to his work in the parish.

To give shape to the book, the editor has arranged the essays in sections. He begins with a group on the Beda itself, and then sets the perspective with some historical studies of Rome. The immediate Romanita, which is so much of the value of a Roman training, is suggested by articles on Roman scenes—the visit to the Seven Churches, the Station Churches of Lent, the description of a canonization, and so on. Moving out of Rome itself, there are some delightful pen-portraits of well-known "gitas" to Genazzano, Loreto, and in the steps of St Pius X. On a different theme, to give an idea of the variety of conversion, some students have written a "Road to Damascus" series. And finally there is a complete study of the patron, St Bede, as a theologian, historian and student of Scripture.

Among the well-known contributors are Mgr Vernon Johnson, Arnold Lunn, Archbishop Mathew, and Mgr Gordon Wheeler.

M. H.

*Missale Gallicanum Vetus* (Cod. Vat. Palat. lat. 493). By Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, O.S.B., Leo Eizenhöfer, O.S.B. and Petrus Siffrin, O.S.B. (=Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta, Series Major: Fontes III). (Rome, Casa Editrice Herder, 1958. Pp. xxv + 166 + 7 plates. Price: Lire 3.300.)

THE Roman Liturgical Institute, established at Sant' Anselmo on the Aventine under the direction of Dom Mohlberg, pursues its vast programme of major publications with astonishing speed and efficiency. After publishing the monumental *Sacramentarium Veronense* or "Leonine" Sacramentary (cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, September 1956; pp. 568-70) and the *Missale Francorum* (*ibid.*, 1957, pp. 477-8) in this same series, it now gives us the *Missale Gallicanum Vetus*, another ancient sacramentary, written in France during the eighth century, which survives only in a single incomplete manuscript in the Vatican Library.

As in the case of the *Missale Francorum* there was previously no worthy modern edition, and students had to be content with the pioneer editions of Thomasi, Mabillon and Muratori or the convenient reprint of Migne (P.L. 72, col. 339-82); but now we are provided with a completely up-to-date edition which should fully satisfy all the scholar's needs.

The *Missale Gallicanum Vetus* begins with a Mass in honour of St Germanus of Auxerre, followed by prayers for the blessing of Virgins and Widows; the Masses for Advent and Christmas are followed by prayers for the catechumenate, for Holy Week, Easter and the following Sundays. After the Rogation Mass the manuscript ends abruptly at its ninety-ninth folio.

The editors have most commendably embellished this text by printing with it no fewer than nine near-contemporary fragments, hitherto rather inaccessible, each preceded by a short introduction. The most important of them is undoubtedly the seventh-century "Mone Masses", printed here in full in accordance with Dom Wilmart's indications for restoring their primitive order.

A most valuable feature of the volume is the fifteen-page table which indicates in parallel columns the presence or absence in other sacramentaries of the 266 texts of the *Missale Gallicanum Vetus*. Three indices and seven facsimile plates complete this volume, which is fully worthy of the high standards which the Roman Liturgical Institute and the House of Herder have set themselves in this important series of publications.

LOUIS BROU, O.S.B.

## CORRESPONDENCE

## PRAYERS AT THE FOOT OF THE ALTAR

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, August, 1958, p. 512.)

Canon Barrett writes:

It seems to me that ATTENTE's interpretation of rubric No. 16 is too rigid, and that for two reasons: (a) because the variety of meanings of the word *privata* in the rubrics is almost legion, and the best of rubricians hesitate to be pontifical in their application of any given meaning to any particular case. And so the unsolved question remains, "is a dialogue Mass with hymns or chants a *missa privata* in the sense of that rubric?" Many would say "no". (b) Much has been said by Rome on the Mass since the rubrics were framed; notably *Mediator Dei* has been published. Many practices unthought of in the time of Pius V have come into use in recent years, and they seem to have the approval of the Church. The practice of singing during the preparatory prayers and the Last Gospel has not merely the permission but the authorization of the hierarchies of some countries. In this country we are allowed to read the Epistle and Gospel in English as the celebrant reads them at the altar, and this involves the celebrant reciting the Latin in a subdued voice (cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, October 1955, p. 622; April 1956, p. 240; June 1956, p. 364). So it would seem that numerous bishops do not interpret the rubric so strictly as does ATTENTE.

From other writings of his we know that ATTENTE is in sympathy with the liturgical apostolate, and, in particular, he is interested in bringing the psalms back to the use of the people. Does he not think that, in some circumstances at any rate, more spiritual uplift would be given by the singing of a hymn on the theme of the day's Introit, or a Gelineau Psalm (such as No. 42 with its refrain "I will go to the altar of God, praise the God of my joy") than by merely listening to, or even reciting, the psalm in Latin?

## CARYLL HOUSELANDER

Mr F. J. Sheed writes:

Ever since Caryll Houselander died, leaving me her Literary Executor, I have had a stream of enquiries about a biography. Recently the enquiries have grown in frequency and urgency.

Miss Houslander expected that she would soon be forgotten and a biography would not be called for. But she was insistent that in any event none should appear till she had been dead some years. Her friends and I therefore have been content to assemble and arrange the great mass of her papers already in our hands.

The time has not yet come when, according to her instructions, a biography may be prepared for publication. But I should be grateful if all who have letters and other writings of hers would send them to me; they will be copied and returned. It would be a great help also if those who were at any time in special contact with her would write down their memories and send them to me.

With many thanks for your kindness in publishing this letter.

“VESPERS OF OUR LADY”

Fr R. W. Catterall writes:

Note on Fr Howell's rendering of Ps. cxxvi, 2, in *Vespers of Our Lady* (Whitegate Publications).

Oesterley's proposed emendation of MT<sup>1</sup> would give a rendering somewhat as follows:

Unless the Lord grant His blessing (“yesha”, salvation, for “shena”, sleep)

In vain do you rise before day-light;  
In vain do you toil through the night hours,  
You who labour to earn your living.

When Amaziah told Amos: “ekal sham lechem”, he meant: “(Go) and earn your living *there*” (Amos vii, 12).

<sup>1</sup> The Psalms translated with text-critical and exegetical notes, pp. 517 f.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

and  
any  
Her  
ange

ons,  
be  
end  
reat  
her

r.

*Our*  
ring

for

ant:

for  
, in